arXiv:1410.4540v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 12 Nov 2014

# Symmetry, Defects, and Gauging of Topological Phases

Maissam Barkeshli,[1] Parsa Bonderson,[1] Meng Cheng,[1] and Zhenghan Wang[1,2]

[1]*Station Q, Microsoft Research, Santa Barbara, California 93106-6105, USA*
[2]*Department of Mathematics, University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA*

(Dated: November 13, 2014)

We examine the interplay of symmetry and topological order in $2+1$ dimensional topological quantum phases of matter. We present a precise definition of the *topological symmetry* group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$, which characterizes the symmetry of the emergent topological quantum numbers of a topological phase $\mathcal{C}$, and we describe its relation with the microscopic symmetry of the underlying physical system. This allows us to derive a general framework to classify symmetry fractionalization in topological phases, including phases that are non-Abelian and symmetries that permute the quasiparticle types and/or are anti-unitary. We develop a theory of extrinsic defects (fluxes) associated with elements of the symmetry group, extending previous results in the literature. This provides a general classification of $2+1$ dimensional symmetry-enriched topological (SET) phases derived from a topological phase of matter $\mathcal{C}$ with symmetry group $G$. We derive a set of data and consistency conditions, solutions of which define the algebraic theory of the defects, known as a $G$-crossed braided tensor category $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$. This allows us to systematically compute many properties of these theories, such as the number of topologically distinct types of defects associated with each group element, their fusion rules, quantum dimensions, zero modes, braiding exchange transformations, a generalized Verlinde formula for the defects, and modular transformations of the $G$-crossed extensions of topological phases. We also examine the promotion of the global symmetry to a local gauge invariance ("gauging the symmetry"), wherein the extrinsic $G$-defects are turned into deconfined quasiparticle excitations, which results in a different topological phase $\mathcal{C}/G$. We present systematic methods to compute the properties of $\mathcal{C}/G$ when $G$ is a finite group. The quantum phase transition between the topological phases $\mathcal{C}/G$ and $\mathcal{C}$ can be understood to be a "gauge symmetry breaking" transition, thus shedding light on the universality class of a wide variety of topological quantum phase transitions. A number of instructive and/or physically relevant examples are studied in detail.

**Contents**

**I. Introduction** 2
A. Summary of Main Results 3
B. Relation to Prior Work 5

**II. Review of Algebraic Theory of Anyons** 6
A. Fusion 6
B. Braiding 9
C. Gauge Transformations 11

**III. Symmetry of Topological Phases** 12
A. Topological Symmetry 12
B. Global Symmetry 14
C. $H^3_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ Invariance Class of the Symmetry Action 15

**IV. Symmetry Fractionalization** 17
A. Physical Manifestation of On-Site Global Symmetry 18
B. Obstruction to Fractionalization 20
C. Gauge Transformations 23
D. Classification of Symmetry Fractionalization 23
E. Projective Representations of the Global Symmetry 24
F. Quasi-On-Site Global Symmetry 25

**V. Extrinsic Defects** 28
A. Physical Realization of g-Defects 28
B. Topologically Distinct Types of g-Defects 31

**VI. Algebraic Theory of Defects** 32
A. $G$-graded Fusion 32
B. $G$-Crossed Braiding 33
C. Gauge Transformations 39
D. $G$-Crossed Invariants, Twists, and $S$-Matrix 39

**VII. $G$-Crossed Modularity** 45
A. $G$-Crossed Verlinde Formula and $\omega_a$-Loops 45
B. Torus Degeneracy and $G$-Crossed Modular Transformations 46
C. Higher Genus Surfaces 50

**VIII. Gauging the Symmetry** 52
A. Microscopic Models 53
B. Topological Charges and Fusion Rules of $\mathcal{C}/G$ 53
C. Modular Data of the Gauged Theory 56
D. Genus $g$ Ground State Degeneracy 59
E. Universality Classes of Topological Phase Transitions 59

**IX. Classification of Symmetry Enriched Topological Phases** 59
A. Classification of $G$-Crossed Extensions 60
B. Relation to PSG Framework 62
C. Continuous, Spatial, and Anti-Unitary Symmetries 62

**X. Examples** 63
A. Trivial Bosonic State with $G$ symmetry 63
B. Trivial Fermionic State $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}$ with $G$ symmetry 64
C. Semions $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(\pm\frac{1}{2})}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry 66
D. Semions $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(\pm\frac{1}{2})}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_2\times\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry 67

E. $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)}$ Anyons with $N$ odd and $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry 68
F. $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p+\frac{1}{2})}$ Anyons with $N$ even and $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry 69
G. $\mathbb{Z}_N$-Toric Code $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z}_N)$ with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry 70
H. Double-Layer Systems $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry 72
I. $S_3$-Gauge Theory $\mathrm{D}(S_3)$ with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry 73
J. 3-Fermion Model $\mathrm{SO}(8)_1$, a.k.a. $\mathrm{D}'(\mathbb{Z}_2)$, with $S_3$ symmetry 74
K. $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathbb{D}_{10})$ with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry: An $H^3_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ Obstruction 78

**Acknowledgments** 79

**A. Review of Group Cohomology** 79

**B. Projective Representations of Finite Groups** 80

**C. $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(w)}$ and Ising$^{(\nu)}$ Anyon Models** 81

**D. Categorical Formulation of Symmetry, Defects, and Gauging** 82
1. Categorical Topological and Global Symmetry 82
2. Symmetry Defects 82
3. Gauging Categorical Global Symmetry 84
4. General Properties of Gauging 84
5. New Mathematical Results 84

**References** 85

## I. INTRODUCTION

The last two decades of research in condensed matter physics has yielded remarkable progress in the understanding of gapped quantum states of matter. In the absence of any symmetry, gapped quantum systems at zero temperature may still form distinct phases of matter that exhibit *topological order*, which is a new kind of order characterized by patterns of long range entanglements [1, 2]. Topologically ordered phases possess numerous remarkable properties, including quasiparticle excitations with exotic, possibly non-Abelian, exchange transformations (statistics), robust patterns of long range quantum entanglement, robust topology-dependent ground state degeneracies, and protected gapless edge modes.

Recently, a number of exciting new directions have emerged in the study of topological phases of matter, one of which is the study of extrinsic defects [3–21]. This includes the study of extrinsically imposed point-like defects, which are not finite-energy quasiparticle excitations, but nevertheless have a nontrivial interplay with the topological order. These point-like defects can themselves give rise to topologically protected degeneracies, non-Abelian braiding exchange transformations, and exotic localized zero modes. From a practical standpoint, they might be useful in enhancing the computational power of a topological phase used for topologically protected quantum information processing [2, 22–27]. For example, one may engineer non-Abelian defects in an Abelian topological phase, or even defects that realize a computationally universal braiding gate set in a non-Abelian phase that otherwise would not have computationally universal braiding [12]. Several microscopic realizations of such defects have been proposed in the past few years, ranging from lattice dislocations in certain microscopic models [4, 6–8, 16–19] to unconventional methods of coupling fractional quantum Hall (FQH) edge states [6, 9–14]. In addition to point-like extrinsic defects, topological phases also support a rich variety of extrinsic line-like defects. These may either be gapped or gapless, and in both cases there is necessarily a nontrivial interplay with the topological order. In particular, gapped line-like defects, such as gapped boundaries [5, 13, 14, 28–33], have recently been proposed to be used for robust experimental signatures of certain topologically ordered states, such as fractionalization in spin liquids and topological degeneracy in FQH states [34–37].

A second direction that has generated intense research is the interplay of symmetry with topological order. In the presence of symmetries, gapped quantum systems acquire a finer classification [38–60]. Specifically, it is possible for two phases of matter to be equivalent in the absence of the symmetry, but distinct in the presence of symmetry. These are referred to as symmetry-protected topological (SPT) states if the gapped phase is trivial in the absence of symmetry, and as symmetry-enriched topological (SET) states if the gapped phase is topologically nontrivial, even when all symmetries are broken. One-dimensional Haldane phases in spin chains [61, 62], two-dimensional quantum spin Hall insulators [63–65], and three-dimensional time-reversal-invariant topological insulators [66–68] are all well-known examples of SPT states. In contrast, FQH states and gapped quantum spin liquids are examples of SET states, because they possess symmetries (particle number conservation or spin rotational invariance) together with topological order.

In the presence of symmetries, quasiparticles of a topological phase of matter can acquire fractional quantum numbers of the global symmetry. For example, in the $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$ Laughlin FQH state [69], the quasiparticles carry charge in units of $e/3$; in gapped $\mathbb{Z}_2$ quantum spin liquids [70], the quasiparticles can carry unit charge and no spin (chargeons/holons), or zero charge and spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ (spinons). With symmetry, an even larger class of extrinsic defects are possible, as one can always consider a deformation of the Hamiltonian that forces a flux associated with the symmetry into a region of the system, even if this flux is not associated with any deconfined quasiparticle excitation.

When a Hamiltonian that realizes a topological phase of matter possesses a global symmetry, it is natural to consider the topological order that is obtained when this global symmetry is promoted to a local gauge invariance, i.e. "gauging the symmetry." This is useful for a number of reasons: (1) The properties of the resulting gauged theory can be used as a diagnostic to understand the properties of the original, ungauged system [71–74]. (2) Gauging the symmetry provides a relation between two different topological phases of matter, and can give insight into the nature of the quantum phase transition between them [75–78]. (3) Understanding the relation between such phases may aid in the development of micro-

scopic Hamiltonians for exotic topological phases (described by the gauged theory), by starting with known models of simpler topological phases (described by the ungauged theory).

Although a remarkable amount of progress has been made on these deeply interrelated topics, a completely general understanding is lacking, and many questions remain. For example, although there are many partial results, the current understanding of fractionalization of quantum numbers, along with the classification and characterization of SETs is incomplete. Moreover, while there have been many results towards understanding the properties of extrinsic defects in topological phases, there has been no general systematic understanding and, in particular, no concrete method of computing all the rich topological properties of the defects for an arbitrary topological phase. The study of topological phase transitions between different topological phases is also missing a general theory.

In this paper, we develop a general systematic framework to understand these problems. We develop a way to characterize the interplay of symmetry and topological order in $2+1$ dimensions, thus leading us to a general understanding of how symmetries can be consistently fractionalized in a given topological phase. Subsequently, we develop a mathematical framework to describe and compute the properties of extrinsic point-like defects associated with symmetries of the topological phase. Our construction utilizes results and ideas from recent mathematical literature [79–82]. However, since our focus is on concrete applications to physics, our approach and formalism is quite different from the more abstract categorical formalism that has been presented in the mathematical literature. Our framework for understanding the topological properties of extrinsic defects then provides us with a way to systematically classify and characterize SETs (including SPTs) in $2+1$ dimensions. Finally, we again build on results from the mathematics literature [80, 83] to provide a systematic prescription for gauging the symmetry of a system in a topological phase of matter.

### A. Summary of Main Results

Due to the length of this paper, we will briefly summarize the main results of our work here. Before we proceed, we note that our starting framework to describe a topological phase without symmetry is in terms of an anyon model $\mathcal{C}$, for which we provide a detailed review of the general theory in Sec. II. Mathematically, $\mathcal{C}$ is referred to as a unitary modular tensor category (UMTC). Physically, it can be thought of as the set of topological charges, which label the topologically distinct types of quasiparticles (anyons), together with data that self-consistently specifies their fusion, associativity, and braiding exchange transformations. As this paper draws upon a number of technical mathematical concepts, we have made an effort to include precise definitions and explanations of most of these concepts, in order to make it as self-contained as possible.

#### 1. Symmetry and Fractionalization

Symmetry fractionalization refers to the manner in which topologically nontrivial quasiparticles carry quantum numbers that are (in a sense) fractions of the quantum numbers of the underlying local constituents of the system, such as electrons or spins. We show that for a symmetry $G$ (continuous or discrete, unitary or anti-unitary), symmetry fractionalization is classified by two objects, $[\rho]$ and $[\mathbf{t}]$, which we briefly describe here. The square brackets here indicate equivalence classes, as there are non-physical redundancies, i.e. a sort of gauge freedom, associated with both objects that should be factored out.

We first define the group of *topological symmetries*, denoted $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$, of a topological phase of matter described by $\mathcal{C}$. Roughly speaking, this corresponds to all of the different ways the theory $\mathcal{C}$ can be mapped back onto itself, including permutations of topological charges, in such a way that the topological properties are left invariant. A subset of such auto-equivalence maps called "natural isomorphisms," which do not permute topological charges and leave all the basic data unchanged, provide the redundancy under which one equates the auto-equivalence maps to form the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. Simple examples of auto-equivalence maps include layer permutations in multi-layer systems that consist of multiple identical copies of a topological phase, or electric-magnetic duality in phases described by a $\mathbb{Z}_n$ gauge theory.

We next consider a physical system in a topological phase described by $\mathcal{C}$, which also has a global symmetry described by the group $G$. One must specify how $G$ acts upon the topological degrees of freedom and thus interplays with the topological symmetry. This is characterized by a group action

$$[\rho] : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C}). \tag{1}$$

The notation means that we assign an auto-equivalence map $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ to each group element $\mathbf{g} \in G$ and take the equivalence classes of these maps under natural isomorphism. (It is useful to work with a specific choice $\rho \in [\rho]$ when deriving results, and then demonstrate invariance within the equivalence class for certain quantities at the end.)

Once $[\rho]$ is specified, we examine the symmetry action in an underlying physical system described by a microscopic Hamiltonian. We show that symmetry fractionalization is possible only when a certain obstruction class $[\mathfrak{O}] \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ vanishes. Here $\mathcal{A}$ corresponds to the group of Abelian topological charges in $\mathcal{C}$, where group multiplication is defined by fusion. $H^3_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ is the 3rd cohomology group of $G$ with coefficients in the group $\mathcal{A}$, where the subscript $[\rho]$ indicates the inclusion of the symmetry action in the definition of the cohomology, which, in this context, is a potential permutation of the topological charge values in $\mathcal{A}$ (and, hence, is independent of the choice of $\rho \in [\rho]$). When the obstruction vanishes, it is possible to consistently fractionalize the symmetry in the system, meaning one can specify a local projective symmetry action that is compatible with the symmetry action on the topological degrees of freedom. The different ways in which the symmetry can be fractionalized is classified by the 2nd co-

homology group $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$, with there being a distinct fractionalization class for each element $[\mathbf{t}] \in H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$. More precisely, the set of symmetry fractionalization classes form an $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ torsor, which means the classes are not themselves elements of $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$, but rather the distinct fractionalization classes are related to each other by an action of distinct elements $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$. The precise definitions of these mathematical objects will appear in the main text and appendices.

### 2. Extrinsic Defects

When the physical system has a symmetry $G$, one can consider the possibility of point-like defects associated with group elements $\mathbf{g} \in G$, which may be thought of as fluxes. In many ways, a defect behaves like quasiparticle. However, an important distinction is that when a quasiparticle is transported around a $\mathbf{g}$-defect, it is acted upon by the corresponding symmetry action $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$, possibly permuting the quasiparticle's topological charge value. Another important distinction is that, since $G$ describes a global symmetry and not a local gauge invariance in this context, these defects do not correspond to finite-energy excitations of the system. Thus, they must be *extrinsically imposed* by modifying the Hamiltonian in a manner that forces the $\mathbf{g}$-flux into the system. If the position of the defects are allowed to fluctuate quantum mechanically, the energy cost of separating such defects will grow either logarithmically or linearly in their separation. Therefore they may also be viewed as *confined* excitations of the system.

The extrinsic defects of a topological phase have many rich topological properties, and one purpose of this paper is to develop a concrete algebraic formalism, analogous to the algebraic theory of anyons, that can be used to characterize and systematically compute the many topological properties of such defects. For this, we begin by generalizing the notion of topological charge to apply to defects, with distinct types of $\mathbf{g}$-defects carrying distinct values of topological charge. We then extend the description of the original anyon model $\mathcal{C}$, describing the topological phase, to a $G$-graded fusion theory

$$\mathcal{C}_G = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{g}\in G} \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}, \tag{2}$$

where each sector $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ describes the topologically distinct types of $\mathbf{g}$-defects and the fusion and associativity relations respect the group multiplication of $G$, i.e. a $\mathbf{g}$-defect and an $\mathbf{h}$-defect fuse to a $\mathbf{gh}$-defect. In this way, the quasiparticles of the original topological phase correspond to the $\mathbf{0}$-defects, i.e. $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}} = \mathcal{C}$.

Subsequently, we introduce a generalized notion of braiding transformations that incorporates the symmetry action $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ as a quasiparticle or defect passes around a $\mathbf{g}$-defect. This is referred to as "$G$-crossed braiding" and defines a $G$-crossed braided tensor category (BTC), which we denote as $\mathcal{C}^{\times}_G$. Similar to anyon models, we provide a diagrammatic representation of the states and operators of the theory and identify the basic data that fully characterizes the theory. We introduce consistency conditions on the basic data, which generalize the famous hexagon equations for braiding consistency to "heptagon equations" for $G$-crossed braiding, and impose consistency of the incorporation of the symmetry action and its fractionalization within the theory.

Given the basic data of the $G$-crossed theory, we are able to compute all properties of the defects, including their fusion rules, quantum dimensions, localized zero modes, and braiding statistics. We find that topological twists, which characterize the braiding statistics of objects, is not a gauge invariant quantity for defects, which meshes well with the notion that the defects are associated with confined objects. Another important property that we derive is that the total quantum dimension $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{g}}$ of the sector $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ is the same for all $\mathbf{g} \in G$, i.e. $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{g}} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}$ (this holds generally for a $G$-graded fusion category). We also find that the number of topologically distinct $\mathbf{g}$-defects, $|\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}|$, is equal to the number of $\mathbf{g}$-invariant topological charges [i.e. those for which $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a) = a$] in the original UMTC $\mathcal{C}_0$.

We describe the notion of $G$-crossed modular transformations when the system inhabits a torus or surfaces of arbitrary genus. These extend the usual definition of modular transformations, generated by $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ matrices, to cases where there are defect branch lines wrapping the cycles of the torus or higher genus surface. We derive a $G$-crossed generalization of the Verlinde formula, which relate the fusion rules of defects (and quasiparticles) to the $G$-crossed $S$-matrix.

For every $2+1$ dimensional SET phase, one can construct a corresponding $G$-crossed theory $\mathcal{C}^{\times}_G$ describing the defects in the topological phase. Therefore, the $G$-crossed defect theories $\mathcal{C}^{\times}_G$ provide both a classification and a characterization of SET phases in $2+1$ dimensions. In this way, one can classify SETs by solving the $G$-crossed consistency relations. However, it has recently been proven [81] that, for a finite group $G$, which describes unitary on-site symmetries, the distinct $G$-crossed extensions $\mathcal{C}^{\times}_G$ of a topological phase described by $\mathcal{C}$ are fully classified by three objects: the symmetry action $[\rho] : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ describing how the global symmetry acts on the topological degrees of freedom, an element $[\mathbf{t}] \in H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ that classifies the symmetry fractionalization, and an element $[\alpha] \in H^3(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$ that classifies the defects' associativity.

Importantly, not every fractionalization class in $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ corresponds to a well-defined SET in $2+1$ dimensions. In some cases there can be an additional obstruction that prevents the existence of a solution of the $G$-crossed consistency relations (such as the heptagon equations). The inability to solve these consistency conditions and thus to construct a consistent extended theory $\mathcal{C}^{\times}_G$ indicates that the symmetry fractionalization class is anomalous. A number of recent examples have shown that anomalous realizations of symmetry fractionalization, while they cannot exist in 2+1 dimensions, can instead exist as a surface termination state of a $3+1$ dimensional SPT state [84–94].

Similar to the $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ classification of fractionalization classes, the set of defect associativity classes forms a $H^3(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$ torsor, meaning distinct $G$-crossed theories

(with the same $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$, symmetry action, and fractionalization class) are related to each other by an action of the distinct elements of $H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$. This action by $[\alpha] \in H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ is essentially factoring in a group $G$ SPT state with associativity defined by $[\alpha]$ to possibly produce another $G$-crossed theory. Whether factoring in this group $G$ SPT actually provides a distinct SET can be determined in our framework by seeing whether factoring in the SPT has the equivalent effect of relabelling different $\mathbf{g}$ defects. These results together then suggest that $([\rho], [\mathbf{t}], [\alpha])$ parametrize SETs in 2+1 dimensions, at least for finite on-site unitary symmetries.

#### 3. Gauging the Symmetry

Given a topological phase of matter $\mathcal{C}$, together with its symmetry-enriched class, i.e. its $G$-crossed defect theory $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, one can promote the symmetry $G$ to a local gauge invariance ("gauging the symmetry"). This results in a different topological order, which we denote $\mathcal{C}/G$, in which the $\mathbf{g}$-defects become deconfined quasiparticle excitations. Importantly, the gauged theory $\mathcal{C}/G$ depends on the particular $G$-crossed extension $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ of $\mathcal{C}$, which thus forms the input data necessary to construct the gauged theory. The topological properties of the gauged theory $\mathcal{C}/G$ can alternatively be viewed from a different perspective as topological invariants of the associated SET, which is described by $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$.

We first examine the question of how one may obtain a microscopic Hamiltonian that realizes the topological phase $\mathcal{C}/G$, given a Hamiltonian that realizes a topological phase $\mathcal{C}$. Along this line, we provide a concrete model demonstrating how this may be done in the case where $G$ is an Abelian finite group.

Next, we provide a review of some known results from the mathematics literature for obtaining the properties of $\mathcal{C}/G$ from those of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, in particular the topological charge content, quantum dimensions, and fusion rules. It follows from these results that the total quantum dimension of the gauged theory $\mathcal{C}/G$ is always related to the total quantum dimension of the original theory $\mathcal{C}$ and its $G$-crossed extension by $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}/G} = |G|^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_G} = |G|\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{C}$. We further conjecture, based on physical considerations, a formula for the topological twists of quasiparticles in $\mathcal{C}/G$. Based on this conjecture we show that the chiral central charge (mod 8) is the same in these theories. We also derive a formula for the modular $S$-matrix of $\mathcal{C}/G$ in terms of the data of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$. Finally, we discuss how to compute the ground state degeneracy of $\mathcal{C}/G$ on higher genus surfaces in terms of the properties of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, without needing to derive the full fusion rules of $\mathcal{C}/G$. This is useful for practical computations of the number of topological charge types and their quantum dimensions.

Finally, we observe that, since $\mathcal{C}/G$ and $\mathcal{C}$ are related to each other by gauging $G$, the topological quantum phase transition between them can be understood as a discrete $G$ "gauge symmetry breaking" transition. This point of view provides insight into the universality class of the topological phase transitions between a wide variety of distinct topological phases.

#### 4. Examples

After developing the general theory, summarized above, we study many concrete examples. We focus on examples that are physically relevant and/or which illustrate different technical aspects and subtleties of using the theory and methods developed in this paper to derive the various properties of $G$-crossed extensions and gauged theories. A particularly interesting example that we examine is the "three-fermion theory," also known as $\mathrm{SO}(8)_1$, with the non-Abelian symmetry group $G = S_3$ acting nontrivially. Gauging the $S_3$-symmetry of the three-fermion theory results in a rank 12 (weakly integral) UMTC that has not been previously described elsewhere.

### B. Relation to Prior Work

The background context of our work is closely related to a large number of works spanning many different fields. Here we briefly comment on the relation to some of the most closely related works.

A framework, called the projective symmetry group (PSG), to address the problem of classifying SETs was originally introduced in Ref. [38]. As we discuss in Sec. IX B, the PSG framework only captures a subset of possible types of symmetry fractionalization and, thus, misses a large class of possible SETs for a given topological phase. Our results on the general classification of symmetry fractionalization in terms of $H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ extends the previous result of Ref. [51], which specifically applies to Abelian topological phases where the symmetries do not permute the topological charge values. A preliminary consideration of some of these ideas can also be found at a more abstract level in the discussion in Appendix F of Ref. [95].

The notion of a $G$-crossed braided tensor category (BTC) was originally introduced in the mathematics literature in Refs. [79, 82]. Similarly, the full classification of $G$-crossed extensions in terms of the objects $([\rho], [\mathbf{t}], [\alpha])$ and the possible obstructions, summarized in the previous subsection, has previously appeared in the mathematics literature [81] in the problem of extending a fusion category or a braided fusion category by a finite group $G$.

With respect to these prior mathematical results, our results can be viewed as both providing (1) a new and detailed concrete formulation of the theory of $G$-crossed BTC, and (2) providing the physical context and interpretations of the abstract mathematical results by directly linking them to their physical realizations. In particular, we provide a physical interpretation of these mathematical objects in terms of the fusion and braiding properties of extrinsic defects associated with group elements $\mathbf{g} \in G$. Moreover, since the mathematical constructions are highly abstract, they may obscure many of the important details that are of interest for physical applications. For example, we provide concrete definitions of the $[\mathfrak{O}]$ obstruction and $[\mathbf{t}]$ classification objects in terms of the symmetry action on the states of quasiparticles. The mathematical treatment that we utilize in this paper, working directly with the topologically distinct classes of simple objects (quasiparticles

and defects), their basic data ($F$-symbols, $R$-symbols, etc.), and their consistency conditions, is referred to in mathematical parlance as a "skeletonization" of a category. Our work may, thus, be viewed as a new mathematical result that introduces the skeletonization of $G$-crossed BTCs and provides a new definition of the theory of $G$-crossed BTCs.

Extrinsic defects in topological phases of matter have been increasingly studied in various examples in the condensed matter physics literature [4–21]. One purpose of our work is to provide a totally general treatment of extrinsic twist defects that captures all of their topologically nontrivial properties, provides a framework for computing them, and can be applied to arbitrary topological phases of matter. In recent years, such defects have also been studied in the mathematical physics literature, both for conformal field theory (CFT) [96] and for topological quantum field theory (TQFT) [97, 98]. While our work has some overlap with these, our approach is quite different. Our emphasis is on developing concrete methods that can be used to compute various topological properties of the defects and direct physical interpretations that apply in the condensed matter physics setting.

The idea of "gauging" a discrete symmetry of a topological phase of matter is closely related to the concept of "orbifolding" in rational CFT [99, 100]. However, while there are often close relations between CFTs and topological phases of matter, they are distinct physical systems, and so they each require their own physical understanding. Many of our general results and examples go beyond the analogous problem that has been studied in the CFT literature, for which the general results are limited. For example, much of the CFT work on orbifolding is typically focused on holomorphic CFTs, which correspond to only a small class of possible topological phases. The important classifying objects $([\rho], [\mathbf{t}], [\alpha])$ summarized above also have not, to our knowledge, been generally discussed in the CFT literature on orbifolding.

Our work on gauging topological phases of matter is closely related to work of Refs. [80, 101], which sets out to find a mathematical formulation in terms of MTCs of the concept of orbifolding in CFTs. For example, Ref. [80] also contains results on the extended Verlinde algebra. Again, our results extend some of these mathematical results and put them into more concrete terms with direct physical context.

In recent years, the notion of gauging symmetries of a topological phase has been increasingly studied in the condensed matter literature. The resulting non-Abelian topological phases that are obtained by gauging either the layer exchange symmetry of bilayer Abelian FQH states, or the electric-magnetic duality of $\mathbb{Z}_N$ toric code models were studied in Refs. [77, 102, 103]. In studies of SPT phases, the notion of gauging the symmetry of the system has been powerful in developing an understanding of the distinction between SPT states [71, 74]. While those were isolated classes of examples, our work provides a concrete prescription to derive the properties obtained when any topological phase of matter $\mathcal{C}$ is gauged by any finite group $G$.

While gauging a discrete global symmetry $G$ of a topological phase $\mathcal{C}$ gives rise to a new topological phase $\mathcal{C}/G$, there is an inverse process, known as topological Bose condensation [75], which takes $\mathcal{C}/G$ to $\mathcal{C}$. The quantum phase transition between $\mathcal{C}/G$ and $\mathcal{C}$ corresponds to a confinement/deconfinement transition or, in other words, a "gauge symmetry breaking" transition. The notion of condensation was discussed mathematically in Refs. [104, 105]. This has been studied in the context of topological phases in Refs. [28, 75, 106, 107]. In the topological Bose condensation picture, there is an intermediate stage between $\mathcal{C}/G$ and $\mathcal{C}$, referred to as the $\mathcal{T}$-theory in Ref. [75], which includes the objects that are confined by the condensate. These confined objects are $\mathbf{g}$-defects with a $G$-crossed theory $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ that provides the complete description of the topological properties of the $\mathcal{T}$-theory, including their braiding transformations, which has not been previously identified. Most of the prior work along these lines has focused on the nature of the topological phase that is obtained when topologically non-trivial bosons of a topological phase are condensed. However, Refs. [76–78] focused on the nature of the universality class of quantum phase transitions associated with topological Bose condensation by studying some simple classes of examples when $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$. We generalize these results to an understanding of the universality class of topological Bose condensation transitions between $\mathcal{C}/G$ to $\mathcal{C}$ for general finite $G$.

## II. REVIEW OF ALGEBRAIC THEORY OF ANYONS

This section provides a summary review of anyon models, known in mathematical terminology as unitary braided tensor categories (UBTC) [108, 109]. We use a diagrammatic representation of anyonic states and operators acting on them, following Refs. [95, 110–112]. (Many relations in this review section are stated without proof. For additional details and proofs, we refer the reader to the references listed here or, in some cases, to Secs. VI and VII where one may find the generalized versions.) This formalism encodes the purely topological properties of anyons, i.e. quasiparticle excitations of topological phases of matter, independent of any particular physical realization.

### A. Fusion

In this section, we describe the properties of fusion tensor categories, and will introduce braiding in the next. We begin with a set $\mathcal{C}$ of superselection sector labels called topological or anyonic charges $a, b, c \ldots \in \mathcal{C}$. [172] (We will often also use the symbol $\mathcal{C}$ to refer the category itself.) These conserved charges obey an associative fusion algebra

$$a \times b = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} N_{ab}^c c \tag{3}$$

where the fusion multiplicities $N_{ab}^c$ are non-negative integers which indicate the number of different ways the charges $a$ and $b$ can be combined to produce the charge $c$. We require that fusion is finite, meaning $\sum_c N_{ab}^c$ is a finite integer for any

fixed $a$ and $b$. Associativity requires these to satisfy

$$\sum_e N_{ab}^e N_{ec}^d = \sum_f N_{af}^d N_{bc}^f. \tag{4}$$

In the diagrammatic formalism, each line segment is oriented (indicated with an arrow) and ascribed a value of topological charge. Each fusion product has an associated vector space $V_{ab}^c$ with $\dim V_{ab}^c = N_{ab}^c$, and its dual (splitting) space $V_c^{ab}$. The states in these fusion and splitting spaces are assigned to trivalent vertices with the appropriately corresponding anyonic charges, with basis states written as

$(d_c/d_a d_b)^{1/4}$  $= \langle a, b; c, \mu| \in V_{ab}^c,$ (5)



$(d_c/d_a d_b)^{1/4}$ $= |a, b; c, \mu\rangle \in V_c^{ab},$ (6)



where $\mu = 1, \ldots, N_{ab}^c$. (Many anyon models of interest have no fusion multiplicities, i.e. $N_{ab}^c = 0$ or 1 only, in which case the trivial vertex labels $\mu$ will usually be left implicit.) The bra/ket basis vectors are orthonormal. The normalization factors $(d_c/d_a d_b)^{1/4}$ are included so that diagrams will be in the isotopy invariant convention, as will be explained in the following. Isotopy invariance means that the value of a (labeled) diagram is not changed by continuous deformations, so long as open endpoints are held fixed and lines are not passed through each other or around open endpoints. Open endpoints should be thought of as ending on some boundary (e.g. a timeslice or an edge of the system) through which isotopy is not permitted. We note that the diagrammatic expressions of states and operators are, by design, reminiscent of particle worldlines, but there is not a strict identification between the two. The anyonic charge lines are only a diagrammatic expression of the algebraic encoding of the topological properties of anyons, and interpreting them as worldlines is not always correct.

Diagrammatically, inner products are formed by stacking vertices so the fusing/splitting lines connect

 $= \delta_{cc'}\delta_{\mu\mu'}\sqrt{\dfrac{d_a d_b}{d_c}}$ , (7)



which can be applied inside more complicated diagrams. Note that this diagrammatically encodes charge conservation. Since we want to use this to describe the states associated with anyonic quasiparticles (in a topological phase of matter), we require the inner product to be positive definite, i.e. $d_a$ are required to be real and positive.

With this inner product, the identity operator on a pair of anyons with charges $a$ and $b$ is written (diagrammatically) as the partition of unity

$\mathbb{1}_{ab} =$  $= \sum_{c,\mu} \sqrt{\dfrac{d_c}{d_a d_b}}$  . (8)



A similar decomposition applies for an arbitrary number of anyons.

More complicated diagrams can be constructed by connecting lines of matching charge. The resulting vector spaces obey a notion of associativity given by isomorphisms, which can be reduced using the expression of three anyon splitting/fusion spaces in terms of two anyon splitting/fusion

$$V_d^{abc} \cong \bigoplus_e V_e^{ab} \otimes V_d^{ec} \cong \bigoplus_f V_f^{bc} \otimes V_d^{af}, \tag{9}$$

to isomorphisms called $F$-moves, which are written diagrammatically as

 $= \sum_{f,\mu,\nu} \left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)}$  . (10)



The $F$-moves can be viewed as changes of bases for the states associated with quasiparticles. To describe topological phases, these are required to be unitary transformations, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\left(F_d^{abc}\right)^{-1}\right]_{(f,\mu,\nu)(e,\alpha,\beta)} &= \left[\left(F_d^{abc}\right)^{\dagger}\right]_{(f,\mu,\nu)(e,\alpha,\beta)} \\ &= \left[F_d^{abc}\right]^*_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

In order for this notion of associativity to be self-consistent, any two sequences of $F$-moves applied within an arbitrary diagram which start from the same state space and end in the same state space must be equivalent. MacLane's coherence theorem [113] establishes that this consistency can be achieved by imposing the constraint called the Pentagon equation

$$\sum_\delta \left[F_e^{fcd}\right]_{(g,\beta,\gamma)(l,\delta,\nu)} \left[F_e^{abl}\right]_{(f,\alpha,\delta)(k,\lambda,\mu)} = \sum_{h,\sigma,\psi,\rho} \left[F_g^{abc}\right]_{(f,\alpha,\beta)(h,\sigma,\psi)} \left[F_e^{ahd}\right]_{(g,\sigma,\gamma)(k,\lambda,\rho)} \left[F_k^{bcd}\right]_{(h,\psi,\rho)(l,\mu,\nu)} \tag{12}$$




FIG. 1: The Pentagon equation enforces the condition that different sequences of $F$-moves from the same starting fusion basis decomposition to the same ending decomposition gives the same result. Eq. (12) is obtained by imposing the condition that the above diagram commutes.

which equates the two sequences of $F$-moves shown in Fig. 1. In other words, given a set of fusion rules, one can find all consistent fusion categories by solving the Pentagon equations for all consistent sets of $F$-symbols.

We require the existence of a unique "vacuum" charge $0 \in \mathcal{C}$ for which fusion (and braiding) is trivial. In particular, the fusion coefficients must satisfy $N_{a0}^{c} = N_{0a}^{c} = \delta_{ac}$, charge lines can be added and removed from diagram at will (in other words, there are canonical isomorphisms between $V_a^{a0}$, $V_a^{0a}$, and $\mathbb{C}$), and the associativity relations must obey $\left[F_d^{abc}\right] = \mathbb{1}$ if any one of $a$, $b$, or $c$ equals $0$ when the involved fusions are allowed (this enforces the compatibility of $F$-moves with the previously mentioned canonical isomorphism and corresponds to choosing the basis vectors of $V_a^{a0}$ and $V_a^{0a}$ such that they map to $1$ in the canonical isomorphisms mentioned above). Note that it is not required that $\left[F_d^{abc}\right] = \mathbb{1}$ when $d = 0$, nor is this even generally possible. We often specially denote vacuum lines as dotted lines.

For each $a \in \mathcal{C}$, we require the existence of a conjugate charge, or "antiparticle," $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}$, for which $[F_a^{a\bar{a}a}]_{(0,\alpha)(0,\mu)} \neq 0$. It follows that $N_{ab}^{0} = \delta_{b\bar{a}}$, i.e. $\bar{a}$ is unique and $\dim V_{a\bar{a}}^{0} = 1$. Also, $0 = \bar{0}$ and $\bar{\bar{a}} = a$. Thus, we can write

$$[F_a^{a\bar{a}a}]_{00} = \frac{\varkappa_a}{d_a}, \tag{13}$$

where we have defined the quantum dimension $d_a$ of charge $a$ to be

$$d_a = \left|[F_a^{a\bar{a}a}]_{00}\right|^{-1} \tag{14}$$

and $\varkappa_a$ is a phase. It follows that $d_0 = 1$,

$$d_a = d_{\bar{a}} = \tag{15}$$




Here we have introduced the convention of smoothing out the charge $a$ line at $|a, \bar{a}; 0\rangle$ vertices to form a "cup" when we remove the vacuum charge $0$ line, and similarly forming a "cap" from $\langle a, \bar{a}; 0|$.

We also define the total quantum dimension of $\mathcal{C}$ to be

$$\mathcal{D} = \sqrt{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{C}} d_a^2}. \tag{16}$$

In the diagrammatic formalism, reversing the orientation of a line is equivalent to conjugating the charge labeling it, i.e.




(17)

Isotopy invariance is essentially the ability to introduce and remove bends in a line. Bending a line horizontally (so that the line always flows upward) is trivial (in that it utilizes the canonical isomorphisms of adding/removing vacuum lines), but a complication arises when a line is bent vertically. To understand this, consider the $F$-move associated with this type of bending




(18)

(Notice the vertex normalization comes into play here.) In general, the phase $\varkappa_a = \varkappa_{\bar{a}}^{*}$ is not equal to $1$, but for $a \neq \bar{a}$, it is gauge dependent and can be fixed to $1$ by a gauge choice. For $a = \bar{a}$, $\varkappa_a = \pm 1$ is a gauge invariant quantity, known as the Frobenius-Schur indicator. Thus, we see that one needs more than just diagrammatic vertex normalization to produce isotopy invariance for this kind of bending. This can be dealt with using flags that keep track of nontrivial $\varkappa_a$ phases and unitary transformations (which can be defined in terms of the $F$-symbols) when the legs of a vertex are bent up or down, which can be used, for example, to prove the pivotal property. (We refer the reader to Refs. [95, 111] for details.) It follows that the dimension of fusion/splitting spaces related by bending lines are equal, so

$$N_{ab}^{c} = N_{\bar{a}c}^{b} = N_{c\bar{b}}^{a} = N_{b\bar{c}}^{\bar{a}} = N_{\bar{c}a}^{\bar{b}} = N_{\bar{b}\bar{a}}^{\bar{c}}. \tag{19}$$

We can also define a diagrammatic trace of operators (known as the "quantum trace") by closing the diagram with loops that match the outgoing lines with the respective incoming lines at the same position

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Tr}} X = \widetilde{\mathrm{Tr}} \left[ \right. \tag{20}$$




$$\left. \right] = \sum_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}$$




Connecting the endpoints of two lines labeled by different topological charge values violates charge conservation, so such diagrams evaluate to zero. One can equivalently take the trace either by looping the lines around to the right (as

shown above) or to the left (with their equality following from $d_a = d_{\bar{a}}$).

By taking the trace of $\mathbb{1}_{ab}$ and using isotopy, together with Eqs. (7) and (8), we obtain the important relation

$$d_a d_b = \sum_c N_{ab}^c d_c. \tag{21}$$

Let us define fusion matrices $\mathbf{N}_a$ using the fusion coefficients to be $[\mathbf{N}_a]_{bc} = N_{ba}^c$. We note that the bending relations indicate that $\mathbf{N}_a^T = \mathbf{N}_{\bar{a}}$. From Eq. (21), we see that the vector $\mathbf{v}$ with components $v_c = d_c/\mathcal{D}$ is a normalized eigenvector of each matrix $\mathbf{N}_a$ with corresponding eigenvalue $d_a$. Moreover, the Perron-Frobenius theorem assures us that $\mathbf{v}$ is the only eigenvector (up to overall multiplicative factors) of $\mathbf{N}_a$ with all positive components and that $d_a$ is the largest (in absolute value) eigenvalue of $\mathbf{N}_a$. Thus, the dimension of the state space asymptotically grows as powers of $d_a$ as one increases the number $n$ of $a$ quasiparticles, i.e. $\sum_c \dim V_c^{a\cdots a} = \sum_c [\mathbf{N}_a^n]_{0c} \sim d_a^n$ as $n \to \infty$. If $d_a = 1$, we call charge $a$ Abelian, which is equivalent to saying it has unique fusion with all other charges ($\sum_c N_{ab}^c = 1$ for all $b$). Otherwise, $d_a > 1$ and we call it non-Abelian.

Given fusion rules specified by $N_{ab}^c$, we can define the corresponding Verlinde algebra spanned by elements $\mathbf{v}_a$ which satisfy $\mathbf{v}_{\bar{a}} = \mathbf{v}_a^\dagger$ and

$$\mathbf{v}_a \mathbf{v}_b = \sum_c N_{ab}^c \mathbf{v}_c. \tag{22}$$

Notice that $\mathbf{v}_a$ may be (faithfully) represented by $\mathbf{N}_a$.

### B. Braiding

The theory described in the previous subsection defined a unitary fusion tensor category with positive-definite inner product. We now wish to introduce braiding. For this, we require the fusion algebra to also be commutative, i.e.

$$N_{ab}^c = N_{ba}^c, \tag{23}$$

so that the dimension of the state space is unaltered when the positions of anyons are interchanged.

We note that this, together with associativity, implies $\mathbf{N}_a \mathbf{N}_b = \mathbf{N}_b \mathbf{N}_a$, i.e. all of the fusion matrices commute with each other. Hence, the fusion matrices are also normal and simultaneously diagonalizable by a unitary matrix $\mathbf{P}$. Specifically, $\mathbf{N}_a = \mathbf{P}\Lambda^{(a)}\mathbf{P}^{-1}$, where $[\Lambda^{(a)}]_{bc} = \lambda_b^{(a)}\delta_{bc}$ and the eigenvalues are $\lambda_b^{(a)} = P_{ab}/P_{0b}$. The eigenvalues form the fusion characters of the Verlinde algebra, i.e. for each $b$ the map $\lambda_b : a \mapsto \lambda_b^{(a)}$ is a fusion character satisfying the relations

$$\lambda_e^{(a)}\lambda_e^{(b)} = \sum_c N_{ab}^c \lambda_e^{(c)}, \tag{24}$$

$$\sum_a \lambda_b^{(a)}\lambda_c^{(a)*} = \delta_{bc}\left|P_{0b}\right|^{-2}. \tag{25}$$

Moreover, we have the relation

$$N_{ab}^c = \sum_x \frac{P_{ax}P_{bx}P_{cx}^*}{P_{0x}}. \tag{26}$$

The counterclockwise braiding exchange operator of two anyons is represented diagrammatically by

$R^{ab} =$  $= \sum_{c,\mu,\nu} \sqrt{\frac{d_c}{d_a d_b}} \left[R_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\nu}$  , (27)

where the $R$-symbols are the maps $R_c^{ab} : V_c^{ba} \to V_c^{ab}$ that result from exchanging two anyons of charges $b$ and $a$, respectively, which are in the charge $c$ fusion channel. This can be written as

 (28)

Similarly, the clockwise braiding exchange operator is

$\left(R^{ab}\right)^{-1} =$ . (29)

In order for braiding to be compatible with fusion, we require that the two operations commute. Diagrammatically, this means we can freely slide lines over or under fusion/splitting vertices

 (30)

 . (31)

These relations imply the Yang-Baxter equations for braiding operators, $R_{j,j+1}R_{j-1,j}R_{j,j+1} = R_{j-1,j}R_{j,j+1}R_{j-1,j}$, where $R_{j,j+1}$ is the operator that braids the strands in the $j$th and $(j+1)$th positions in the counterclockwise sense, which are equivalent to the property that lines can slide over braids, since the ability to freely slide lines over/under vertices allows lines to slide over/under braiding operators. Diagrammatically, this is written as

 . (32)

Requiring consistency between fusion and braiding, we find conditions that must be satisfied by the $F$-symbols and $R$-symbols, which may be expressed as the Hexagon equations




FIG. 2: The Hexagon equations enforce the condition that braiding is compatible with fusion, in the sense that different sequences of $F$-moves and $R$-moves from the same starting configuration to the same ending configuration give the same result. Eqs. (33) and (34) are obtained by imposing the condition that the above diagram commutes.

$$\sum_{\lambda,\gamma} \left[R_e^{ac}\right]_{\alpha\lambda} \left[F_d^{acb}\right]_{(e,\lambda,\beta)(g,\gamma,\nu)} \left[R_g^{bc}\right]_{\gamma\mu} = \sum_{f,\sigma,\delta,\psi} \left[F_d^{cab}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\delta,\sigma)} \left[R_d^{fc}\right]_{\sigma\psi} \left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(f,\delta,\psi)(g,\mu,\nu)}, \quad (33)$$

$$\sum_{\lambda,\gamma} \left[\left(R_e^{ca}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\alpha\lambda} \left[F_d^{acb}\right]_{(e,\lambda,\beta)(g,\gamma,\nu)} \left[\left(R_g^{cb}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\gamma\mu} = \sum_{f,\sigma,\delta,\psi} \left[F_d^{cab}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\delta,\sigma)} \left[\left(R_d^{cf}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\sigma\psi} \left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(f,\delta,\psi)(g,\mu,\nu)}. \quad (34)$$

These relations are represented diagrammatically in Fig. 2. MacLane's coherence theorem [113] establishes that if the Pentagon equation and Hexagon equations are satisfied, then any two sequences of $F$-moves and $R$-moves (braiding) applied within an arbitrary diagram which start from the same state space and end in the same state space are equivalent, which is to say that fusion and braiding are consistent. The $F$-symbols and $R$-symbols completely specify a braided tensor category (BTC).

Given the trivial associativity of the vacuum charge 0 ($F_d^{abc} = \mathbb{1}$ when $a$, $b$, or $c = 0$), the Hexagon equations imply that braiding with the vacuum is trivial, i.e. $R_a^{a0} = R_a^{0a} = \left(R_a^{a0}\right)^{-1} = \left(R_a^{0a}\right)^{-1} = 1$.

If we further require unitarity of the theory, then $\left(R^{ab}\right)^{-1} = \left(R^{ab}\right)^{\dagger}$, which can be expressed in terms of $R$-symbols as $\left[\left(R_c^{ab}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\mu\nu} = \left[R_c^{ab}\right]^*_{\nu\mu}$ (which are simply phases when $N_{ab}^c = 1$).

An important quantity derived from braiding is the topological twist (or topological spin) of charge $a$

$$\theta_a = \theta_{\bar{a}} = \sum_{c,\mu} \frac{d_c}{d_a} \left[R_c^{aa}\right]_{\mu\mu} = \frac{1}{d_a}$$  , (35)


which is a root of unity [114]. This can be used to show that the $R$-symbols satisfy the "ribbon property"

$$\sum_{\lambda} \left[R_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\lambda} \left[R_c^{ba}\right]_{\lambda\nu} = \frac{\theta_c}{\theta_a \theta_b} \delta_{\mu\nu}. \quad (36)$$

Another important quantity is the topological $S$-matrix

$$S_{ab} = \mathcal{D}^{-1} \sum_c N_{\bar{a}b}^c \frac{\theta_c}{\theta_a \theta_b} d_c = \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$$  . (37)


It is clear that $S_{ab} = S_{ba} = S_{\bar{a}b}^*$ and $S_{0a} = d_a/\mathcal{D}$. A related invariant quantity

$$M_{ab} = \frac{S_{ab}^* S_{00}}{S_{0a} S_{0b}} \quad (38)$$

is the monodromy scalar component, which plays an important role in anyonic interferometry [112, 115, 116] and which will show up later in the classification of symmetry fractionalizations and group extensions of categories. If $M_{ab} = e^{i\phi(a,b)}$ is a phase, then the braiding of $a$ with $b$ is Abelian in the sense that

 . (39)


Moreover, when this is true, it follows that $M_{ab} M_{ac} = M_{ae}$ whenever $N_{bc}^e \neq 0$.

An important property that follows from the definition of the $S$-matrix is the ability to remove closed loops that encircle other line, which is done by acquiring an amplitude deter-

mined by the $S$-matrix. In particular, we have




$$= \frac{S_{ab}}{S_{0b}} \tag{40}$$

which can be verified by taking the trace of both sides, closing the $b$ charge line into a loop.

Using Eq. (40) for a diagram with two loops of topological charge $a$ and $b$, respectively, linked on a line of topological charge $x$, together with Eqs. (7) and (8) and isotopy, we obtain the important relation

$$\frac{S_{ax}}{S_{0x}}\frac{S_{bx}}{S_{0x}} = \sum_c N_{ab}^c \frac{S_{cx}}{S_{0x}}. \tag{41}$$

This relation shows that $\lambda_{[x]}^{(a)} = S_{ax}/S_{0x}$ is a character of the Verlinde algebra. Here, we wrote $[x]$ to indicate an equivalence class of topological charges that correspond to the same character, reflecting the fact that the $S$-matrix may be degenerate.

When the $S$-matrix is non-degenerate it is unitary, and this is equivalent to the condition that braiding is non-degenerate, which means that for each topological charge $a \neq 0$ there is some charge $b$ such that $R_{ab}R_{ba} \neq \mathbb{1}_{ab}$.

Indeed, when the $S$-matrix is unitary, the equivalence classes $[x]$ of topological charges corresponding to the same Verlinde algebra character are singletons and all the fusion characters of the Verlinde algebra are specified by the $S$-matrix and given by $\lambda_x^{(a)} = S_{ax}/S_{0x}$. In this case, we can also write $P_{ab} = S_{ab}$, which is often phrased as "the $S$-matrix diagonalizes the fusion rules." In this case, we can use the inverse of the $S$-matrix with Eq. (41) to determine the fusion rules from the $S$-matrix, as specified by the Verlinde formula [117]

$$N_{ab}^c = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{C}} \frac{S_{ax}S_{bx}S_{cx}^*}{S_{0x}}. \tag{42}$$

When the $S$-matrix is unitary, the braided tensor category is called a modular tensor category (MTC). Such theories can be consistently defined for 2D manifolds of arbitrary genus and are related to $(2+1)$D TQFTs. In this case, the $S$-matrix together with the $T$-matrix, $T_{ab} = \theta_a\delta_{ab}$, and the charge conjugation matrix $C_{ab} = \delta_{a\bar{b}}$ obey the modular relations

$$(ST)^3 = \Theta C, \quad S^2 = C, \quad C^2 = \mathbb{1} \tag{43}$$

where

$$\Theta = \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{C}} d_a^2\theta_a = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{8}c_-} \tag{44}$$

is a root of unity and $c_- \equiv c - \bar{c}$ is the chiral central charge. These correspond to the TQFT's projective representation of the respective modular transformations on a torus.

Another useful property of a UMTC is that, if a given topological charge $a$ has Abelian braiding with all other charges, i.e. if $M_{ab} = e^{i\phi(a,b)}$ is a phase for all charges $b \in \mathcal{C}$, then $a$ is Abelian in the sense that it has $d_a = 1$ (and hence Abelian fusion and associativity). This follows from unitarity of the $S$-matrix, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sum_b |S_{ab}|^2 = \sum_b \left|\frac{S_{0a}S_{0b}}{S_{00}}M_{ab}\right|^2 \\ &= \sum_b \left|\frac{d_a d_b}{\mathcal{D}}e^{i\phi(a,b)}\right|^2 = d_a^2. \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

In other words, non-Abelian topological charges (those with $d_a > 1$) necessarily have non-Abelian braiding in a UMTC.

Finally, we establish the following property for MTCs, which will be useful for establishing the classification of symmetry fractionalization. If there are phase factors $e^{i\phi_a}$ (defined for all charge values) that satisfy the relation

$$e^{i\phi_a}e^{i\phi_b} = e^{i\phi_c} \tag{46}$$

whenever $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$, then it must be the case that

$$e^{i\phi_a} = M_{ae}^* \tag{47}$$

for some Abelian topological charge $e$. To verify this claim, we write $\lambda^{(a)} = d_a e^{i\phi_a}$ and notice that

$$\lambda^{(a)}\lambda^{(b)} = \sum_c N_{ab}^c \lambda^{(c)}. \tag{48}$$

Hence, it is a fusion character and must be given by $\lambda^{(a)} = S_{ae}/S_{0e}$ for some topological charge $e$. Thus, we have

$$e^{i\phi_a} = \frac{\lambda^{(a)}}{d_a} = \frac{S_{ae}S_{00}}{S_{0e}S_{0a}} = M_{ae}^*, \tag{49}$$

and since this makes $M_{ae}$ a phase for all values of $a$, it follows that $e$ must be an Abelian topological charge. In this case, $M_{ae}^* = S_{ae}/S_{0a}$.

### C. Gauge Transformations

Distinct sets of $F$-symbols and $R$-symbols describe equivalent theories if they can be related by a gauge transformation given by unitary transformations acting on the fusion/splitting state spaces $V_c^{ab}$ and $V_{ab}^c$, which can be though of as a redefinition of the basis states as

$$\widetilde{|a,b;c,\mu\rangle} = \sum_{\mu'} \left[\Gamma_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\mu'} |a,b;c,\mu'\rangle \tag{50}$$

where $\Gamma_c^{ab}$ is the unitary transformation. Such gauge transformations modify the $F$-symbols as

$$\left[\widetilde{F}_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)} = \sum_{\alpha',\beta',\mu',\nu'} \left[\Gamma_e^{ab}\right]_{\alpha\alpha'} \left[\Gamma_d^{ec}\right]_{\beta\beta'} \left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha',\beta')(f,\mu',\nu')} \left[\left(\Gamma_f^{bc}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\mu'\mu} \left[(\Gamma_d^{af})^{-1}\right]_{\nu'\nu} \quad (51)$$

and the $R$-symbols as

$$\left[\widetilde{R}_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{\mu',\nu'} \left[\Gamma_c^{ba}\right]_{\mu\mu'} \left[R_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu'\nu'} \left[\left(\Gamma_c^{ab}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\nu'\nu}. \quad (52)$$

One must be careful not to use the gauge freedom associated with $\Gamma_a^{a0}$ and $\Gamma_b^{0b}$ to ensure that fusion and braiding with the vacuum $0$ remain trivial. More specifically, one should fix $\Gamma_a^{a0} = \Gamma_b^{0b} = \Gamma_0^{00}$. (One can think of this as respecting the canonical isomorphisms that allow one to freely add and remove vacuum lines. Alternatively, one could allow the use of these gauge factors and compensate by similarly modifying the canonical isomorphisms.) It is often useful to consider quantities of the anyon model that are invariant under such gauge transformation. The most relevant gauge invariant quantities are the quantum dimensions $d_a$ and topological twist factors $\theta_a$, since these, together with the fusion coefficients $N_{ab}^c$, usually uniquely specify the theory (there are no known counterexamples).

## III. SYMMETRY OF TOPOLOGICAL PHASES

We would like to consider a system that realizes a topological phase described by a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$ and which has a global unitary or anti-unitary symmetry of the microscopic Hamiltonian described by a group $G$. In this section, we do not require $G$ to be discrete, nor do we assume that the symmetry is on-site. In order to characterize the interplay of symmetry and topological order, we first define the notion of the "topological symmetry" of $\mathcal{C}$, which is independent of the group $G$. We then consider the action of the global symmetry on the topological properties through its relation to the topological symmetry (via a homomorphism from the global symmetry group to the topological symmetry group).

### A. Topological Symmetry

The symmetries of a category $\mathcal{C}$ are described by invertible maps $\varphi : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ from the category to itself. Each such map $\varphi$ can be classified according to whether it is unitary or anti-unitary, and whether it preserves or reverses the spatial parity. We will first consider unitary, parity-preserving symmetries. Such maps are called auto-equivalences, or braided auto-equivalences for a BTC, and may permute the topological charge labels

$$\varphi(a) = a', \quad (53)$$

in such a way that all of the topological properties are left invariant. In particular, the vacuum must always be left invariant under symmetry, so $0' = 0$, and gauge invariant quantities will be left invariant under these permutations of topological charge, so that

$$N_{a'b'}^{c'} = N_{ab}^c \quad (54)$$
$$d_{a'} = d_a \quad (55)$$
$$\theta_{a'} = \theta_a \quad (56)$$
$$S_{a'b'} = S_{ab} \quad (57)$$

under auto-equivalence maps.

Quantities in the theory that are not gauge invariant must be left invariant by auto-equivalence maps, up to some gauge transformation. At a more detailed level, an auto-equivalence $\varphi$ maps basis state vectors of fusion/splitting spaces to (possibly different) basis state vectors of the corresponding fusion/splitting spaces

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi\left(|a,b;c,\mu\rangle\right) &= |a',\widetilde{b';c'},\mu\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mu'} \left[u_{c'}^{a'b'}\right]_{\mu\mu'} |a',b';c',\mu'\rangle\,, \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where $\left[u_{c'}^{a'b'}\right]$ is a unitary transformation that is included so that the map will leave the basic data exactly invariant, rather than just gauge equivalent to their original values. Notice that this mapping to new basis states is generally the same as applying a permutation of labels together with a gauge transformation, so we have used a similar notation to that of the previous section describing fusion/splitting vertex basis gauge transformations.

Under such mappings of the fusion/splitting basis states, the basic data map to

$$\varphi\left(N_{ab}^c\right) = N_{a'b'}^{c'} = N_{ab}^c \quad (59)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi\left(\left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)}\right) &= \left[\widetilde{F}_{d'}^{a'b'c'}\right]_{(e',\alpha,\beta)(f',\mu,\nu)} \\ &= \left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)} \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

$$\varphi\left(\left[R_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\nu}\right) = \left[\widetilde{R}_{c'}^{a'b'}\right]_{\mu\nu} = \left[R_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\nu}. \quad (61)$$

We see that this would generally result in gauge equivalent values of the $F$-symbols and $R$-symbols without the factors $u_{c'}^{a'b'}$, but including these factors in the definition of symmetry maps gives the stronger condition that the $F$-symbols and $R$-symbols are left exactly invariant.

The collection of all such maps $\varphi$ that leave all properties of $\mathcal{C}$ invariant form the set of braided auto-equivalences of $\mathcal{C}$. However, there is redundancy in these maps given by the "natural isomorphisms," which, in this context, are the braided auto-equivalence maps of the form

$$\Upsilon(a) = a \quad (62)$$
$$\Upsilon\left(|a,b;c,\mu\rangle\right) = \frac{\gamma_a\gamma_b}{\gamma_c}|a,b;c,\mu\rangle\,, \quad (63)$$

for some phases $\gamma_a$. It is straightforward to see that such maps always leave all the basic data exactly invariant. Hence, one can think of these natural isomorphisms as vertex basis gauge transformations of the form $[\Gamma_c^{ab}]_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\gamma_a\gamma_b}{\gamma_c}\delta_{\mu\nu}$, which leave the basic data unchanged. [173]

Consequently, we wish to consider braided auto-equivalence maps as equivalent if they are related by a natural isomorphism, and doing so defines a group, which we denote as $\mathrm{Aut}_{0,0}(\mathcal{C})$. (The $0,0$ here indicates unitary and parity preserving, as we will further explain.) In particular, if $\breve{\varphi} = \Upsilon \circ \varphi$ for a natural isomorphism $\Upsilon$, then the braided auto-equivalence maps $\breve{\varphi}$ and $\varphi$ represent the same equivalence class $[\breve{\varphi}] = [\varphi]$. In this way, group multiplication in $\mathrm{Aut}_{0,0}(\mathcal{C})$ is defined by composition up to natural isomorphism $[\varphi_1]\cdot[\varphi_2] = [\varphi_1\circ\varphi_2]$. In other words, $[\varphi_3] = [\varphi_1]\cdot[\varphi_2]$ if for any representatives $\varphi_1$, $\varphi_2$, and $\varphi_3$ of the corresponding equivalence classes, there are natural isomorphisms $\Upsilon_1$, $\Upsilon_2$, and $\Upsilon_3$ such that $\Upsilon_3 \circ \varphi_3 = \Upsilon_1 \circ \varphi_1 \circ \Upsilon_2 \circ \varphi_2$, or, equivalently, if there is a natural isomorphism $\kappa$ such that $\varphi_3 = \kappa \circ \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2$. (These definitions are related by $\kappa = \Upsilon_3^{-1} \circ \Upsilon_1 \circ \varphi_1 \circ \Upsilon_2 \circ \varphi_1^{-1}$.)

There is yet another level of redundancy that arises in the decomposition of the natural isomorphisms into topological charge dependent phase factors, as in Eq. (63). Specifically, there is freedom to equivalently choose

$$\Upsilon\left(|a,b;c,\mu\rangle\right) = \frac{\breve{\gamma}_a\breve{\gamma}_b}{\breve{\gamma}_c}|a,b;c,\mu\rangle \tag{64}$$

$$\breve{\gamma}_a = \zeta_a\gamma_a, \tag{65}$$

for phases $\zeta_a$ that satisfy $\zeta_a\zeta_b = \zeta_c$ whenever $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$. In other words, the phase factors $\zeta_a$ that obey this condition provide a way of decomposing the completely trivial natural isomorphism $\Upsilon = \mathbb{1}$ into topological charge dependent phase factors. As explained at the end of Sec. II B, phase factors that obey this condition are related to some Abelian topological charge $z$ through the relation

$$\zeta_a = M_{az}^*. \tag{66}$$

As such, this redundancy of natural isomorphisms between braided auto-equivalence maps (the natural isomorphisms themselves being a redundancy of the braided auto-equivalences) is classified by the subset $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}$ of Abelian topological charges of the UMTC $\mathcal{C}$, which can also be considered an Abelian group where multiplication in this group is given by the fusion rules. [174]

We may also consider anti-unitary symmetries of the BTC $\mathcal{C}$, which we called braided anti-auto-equivalences. These were previously examined in the context of time-reversal symmetries in Refs. [89, 118]. For anti-unitary symmetries, the map $\varphi$ is anti-unitary, which means it is a bijective, anti-linear map, i.e.

$$\varphi\left(C_\alpha|\alpha\rangle + C_\beta|\beta\rangle\right) = C_\alpha^*\,\varphi\left(|\alpha\rangle\right) + C_\beta^*\,\varphi\left(|\beta\rangle\right), \tag{67}$$

for any states $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ and complex numbers $C_\alpha, C_\beta \in \mathbb{C}$, that also obeys the condition

$$\langle\varphi(\alpha)|\varphi(\beta)\rangle = \langle\alpha|\beta\rangle^*. \tag{68}$$

Any anti-unitary operator $A$ can be written as $A = UK$, where $U$ is a unitary operator and $K$ is the complex conjugation operator. Its inverse is $A^{-1} = A^\dagger = KU^{-1} = KU^\dagger$.

The vertex basis states transform as in Eq. (58) when $\varphi$ is anti-unitary, though any (complex-valued) coefficients in front of such states would be complex conjugated. Under such anti-auto-equivalence mappings of the fusion/splitting basis states, the basic data map to

$$\varphi\left(N_{ab}^c\right) = N_{a'b'}^{c'} = N_{ab}^c \tag{69}$$

$$\varphi\left(\left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)}\right) = \left[\widetilde{F}_{d'}^{a'b'c'}\right]_{(e',\alpha,\beta)(f',\mu,\nu)} = \left[F_d^{abc}\right]^*_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)} \tag{70}$$

$$\varphi\left(\left[R_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\nu}\right) = \left[\widetilde{R}_{c'}^{a'b'}\right]_{\mu\nu} = \left[R_c^{ab}\right]^*_{\mu\nu}. \tag{71}$$

Anti-unitarity similarly introduces complex conjugation for the gauge invariant quantities, so that

$$\theta_{a'} = \theta_a^* \tag{72}$$

$$S_{a'b'} = S_{ab}^*. \tag{73}$$

As mentioned above, when including both unitary and anti-unitary topological symmetries (braided auto-equivalences), it is useful to define a function

$$q\left(\varphi\right) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \varphi \text{ is unitary} \\ 1 & \text{if } \varphi \text{ is anti-unitary} \end{cases}, \tag{74}$$

which specifies when a braided auto-equivalence map is unitary or anti-unitary. When we form equivalence classes of maps related by natural isomorphism, the combined set of unitary and anti-unitary topological symmetries is again a group. The function $q$ provides a homomorphism from this group to $\mathbb{Z}_2$, i.e. $q\left([\varphi_1\circ\varphi_2]\right) = q\left([\varphi_1]\right)q\left([\varphi_2]\right)$, since the composition of a unitary transformation and an anti-unitary transformation is anti-unitary and the composition between two anti-unitary transformations is unitary. This homomorphism defines a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading of the group of unitary and anti-unitary auto-equivalences.

We can also include spatial parity symmetry, which is a unitary symmetry, by introducing an additional $\mathbb{Z}_2$ grading structure. The action of spatial parity on the topological state space and basic data is a somewhat complicated matter, because the quasiparticles may, in principle, exist in a 2D surface of arbitrary topology, and the action of parity depends on both how one chooses to linearly order the quasiparticles for the purposes of writing a fusion tree decomposition of the states, and what is the line across which one performs the parity reflection. The full details of such parity transformations will not be used in this paper, so we will not present them here. However, it is simple to state the transformation of the gauge invariant quantities

$$\varphi\left(N_{ab}^c\right) = N_{a'b'}^{c'} = N_{ab}^c \tag{75}$$

$$\varphi\left(\theta_a\right) = \theta_{a'} = \theta_a^* \tag{76}$$

$$\varphi\left(S_{ab}\right) = S_{a'b'} = S_{ab}^*, \tag{77}$$

which holds for any parity reflection transformation, regardless of the details of quasiparticle ordering or reflection line.

With this in mind, we introduce the function

$$p(\varphi) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \varphi \text{ is spatial parity even} \\ 1 & \text{if } \varphi \text{ is spatial parity odd} \end{cases}. \tag{78}$$

Forming equivalence classes of symmetry transformations under natural isomorphisms, this provides another $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading of the resulting group, since the composition of two parity reversing (odd) transformations is obviously parity preserving (even), and thus $p([\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2]) = p([\varphi_1])\, p([\varphi_2])$.

We write the full group of quantum symmetries of the topological theory as

$$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C}) = \bigsqcup_{q,p\in\{0,1\}} \mathrm{Aut}_{q,p}(\mathcal{C}), \tag{79}$$

where $\mathrm{Aut}_{q,p}(\mathcal{C})$ is the set of equivalence classes (under natural isomorphisms) of braided auto-equivalence maps that are unitary for $q = 0$ or anti-unitary for $q = 1$, and parity preserving for $p = 0$ or parity reversing for $p = 1$.

We consider $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ to be the *topological symmetry* group of $\mathcal{C}$, because it describes the symmetry of the emergent topological quantum numbers of the topological phase, as described by $\mathcal{C}$. This is in contrast to and independent of any global symmetry of the underlying physical system, as described by the microscopic Hamiltonian.

### B. Global Symmetry

We now consider the case where a physical system that realizes a topological phase described by the UMTC $\mathcal{C}$, has a global symmetry group $G$ of the microscopic Hamiltonian. We restrict our attention to the case where the elements of $G$ correspond to symmetries that preserve the orientation of space, i.e. those with $p = 0$. Since the elements of $G$ act as symmetries on $\mathcal{C}$, their action must correspond to a group homomorphism

$$[\rho] : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C}), \tag{80}$$

to the topological symmetry group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$, which is to say that $[\rho_{\mathbf{g}}] \cdot [\rho_{\mathbf{h}}] = [\rho_{\mathbf{gh}}]$. In other words, for each element $\mathbf{g} \in G$, the action of $\mathbf{g}$ can be described by a (unitary or anti-unitary) braided auto-equivalence map $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$, which is a topological symmetry of $\mathcal{C}$, that respects group multiplication by satisfying

$$\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} \circ \rho_{\mathbf{g}} \circ \rho_{\mathbf{h}} = \rho_{\mathbf{gh}}, \tag{81}$$

where $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ is the corresponding natural isomorphism necessary to equate $\rho_{\mathbf{g}} \circ \rho_{\mathbf{h}}$ with $\rho_{\mathbf{gh}}$. We denote the identity element of $G$ as $\mathbf{0}$ and let $\rho_{\mathbf{0}} = \mathbb{1}$ be the completely trivial transformation. Clearly, this gives $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0}} = \kappa_{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{h}} = \mathbb{1}$.

The group action on topological charge labels is simply permutation [with $\rho_{\mathbf{gh}}(0) = 0$], and so must satisfy $\rho_{\mathbf{g}} \circ \rho_{\mathbf{h}}(a) = \rho_{\mathbf{gh}}(a)$. Consequently, $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ is trivial with respect to the action on topological charge labels, i.e. $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(a) = a$. It will be convenient to introduce the shorthand notations

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{\mathbf{g}}a &= \rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a) && (82)\\ \bar{\mathbf{g}} &= \mathbf{g}^{-1} && (83)\\ q(\mathbf{g}) &= q(\rho_{\mathbf{g}}). && (84) \end{aligned}$$

We emphasize that the transformation factors $u_{c'}^{a'b'}$ associated with $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ acting on vertices need not be the same for different $\mathbf{g}$, and, in general, may require nontrivial action of the natural isomorphism $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ in order to respect the group multiplication. We denote the transformation factors $u_{c'}^{a'b'}$ for a given $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ that leaves the basic data invariant as $U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a, {}^{\mathbf{g}}b; {}^{\mathbf{g}}c)$. Thus, with this symmetry action, we have

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(|a,b;c,\mu\rangle) = \sum_{\mu'} \left[U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a, {}^{\mathbf{g}}b; {}^{\mathbf{g}}c)\right]_{\mu\mu'} |{}^{\mathbf{g}}a, {}^{\mathbf{g}}b; {}^{\mathbf{g}}c, \mu'\rangle\,, \tag{85}$$

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(N_{ab}^{c}) = N_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}b}^{{}^{\mathbf{g}}c} = N_{ab}^{c}, \tag{86}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}\left(\left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)}\right) = &\sum_{\alpha',\beta',\mu'\nu'} \left[U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a, {}^{\mathbf{g}}b; {}^{\mathbf{g}}e)\right]_{\alpha\alpha'} \left[U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}e, {}^{\mathbf{g}}c; {}^{\mathbf{g}}d)\right]_{\beta\beta'} \left[F_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}d}^{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}b\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}c}\right]_{({}^{\mathbf{g}}e,\alpha',\beta')({}^{\mathbf{g}}f,\mu',\nu')} \\ &\times \left[U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}b, {}^{\mathbf{g}}c; {}^{\mathbf{g}}f)^{-1}\right]_{\mu'\mu} \left[U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a, {}^{\mathbf{g}}f; {}^{\mathbf{g}}d)^{-1}\right]_{\nu'\nu} = K^{q(\mathbf{g})} \left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)} K^{q(\mathbf{g})} \end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}}\left(\left[R_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\nu}\right) = \sum_{\mu',\nu'} \left[U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}b, {}^{\mathbf{g}}a; {}^{\mathbf{g}}c)\right]_{\mu\mu'} \left[R_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}c}^{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}b}\right]_{\mu'\nu'} \left[U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a, {}^{\mathbf{g}}b; {}^{\mathbf{g}}c)^{-1}\right]_{\nu'\nu} = K^{q(\mathbf{g})} \left[R_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\nu} K^{q(\mathbf{g})}, \tag{88}$$

$$\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(|a,b;c,\mu\rangle) = \sum_{\nu} \left[\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(a,b;c)\right]_{\mu\nu} |a,b;c,\nu\rangle\,, \tag{89}$$

$$\left[\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(a,b;c)\right]_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \left[U_{\mathbf{g}}(a,b;c)^{-1}\right]_{\mu\alpha} K^{q(\mathbf{g})} \left[U_{\mathbf{h}}({}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}a, {}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}b; {}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}c)^{-1}\right]_{\alpha\beta} K^{q(\mathbf{g})} \left[U_{\mathbf{gh}}(a,b;c)\right]_{\beta\nu}. \tag{90}$$

We note that, to account for the possibility of anti-unitary symmetries, we have inserted the complex conjugation oper-

ators $K$ in such a way that has the effect of complex conjugating the $F$-symbol, $R$-symbol, or $U_{\mathbf{h}}$-symbol that is sandwiched between a pair of $K$ operators when $\mathbf{g}$ corresponds to an anti-unitary symmetry, which has $q(\mathbf{g}) = 1$.

Since $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ is a natural isomorphism, its action on vertices takes the form

$$[\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(a,b;c)]_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\beta_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}{\beta_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}\delta_{\mu\nu}, \tag{91}$$

where $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ are phases that only depend on the topological charge $a$ and the group elements $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{h}$.

As discussed in the previous subsection, there is redundancy due to the freedom of choosing how one decomposes a natural isomorphism into the topological charge dependent phase factors. Specifically, it is always possible to transform the $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ phases into

$$\breve{\beta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}), \tag{92}$$

while leaving $\breve{\kappa}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(a,b;c) = \kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(a,b;c)$ unchanged, if the phases $\nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ satisfy $\nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\nu_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \nu_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ whenever $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$. Moreover, it is clear that whenever two sets of phase factors $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ and $\breve{\beta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ give the same $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(a,b;c)$, they must be related by $\nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ of this form. Therefore, the derived properties of $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ and $\breve{\beta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ related in this manner should be considered equivalent, and this redundancy should be viewed as a sort of gauge freedom.

Requiring the symmetry action on vacuum to be trivial imposes the conditions

$$U_{\mathbf{g}}(0,0;0) = U_{\mathbf{g}}(a,0;a) = U_{\mathbf{g}}(0,a;a) = 1, \tag{93}$$

which makes the symmetry action compatible with introducing and removing vacuum lines at will. Clearly, $\rho_{\mathbf{0}} = \mathbb{1}$ requires $U_{\mathbf{0}}(a,b;c) = \mathbb{1}$.

Eq. (93) requires

$$\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(0,0;0) = \beta_0(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = 1. \tag{94}$$

Since $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0}} = \kappa_{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{h}} = \mathbb{1}$, it follows that

$$\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0})\beta_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0}) = \beta_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0}) \tag{95}$$

$$\beta_a(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{h})\beta_b(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{h}) = \beta_c(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{h}) \tag{96}$$

whenever $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$. Given the gauge freedom described in Eq. (92), it is always possible to freely modify such terms to be trivial, so we will always impose on them the simplifying condition

$$\beta_a(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) = \beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0}) = \beta_a(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{h}) = 1, \tag{97}$$

as a choice of gauge.

We can use Eq. (81) to write the decomposition of $\rho_{\mathbf{ghk}}$ in the two equivalent ways related by associativity (leaving the $\circ$ symbols implicit from now on)

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{\mathbf{ghk}} &= \kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{hk}} \\
&= \kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}\kappa_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}}\rho_{\mathbf{h}}\rho_{\mathbf{k}} \\
&= \kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}\kappa_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{h}}\rho_{\mathbf{k}} \\
&= \kappa_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}}\rho_{\mathbf{gh}}\rho_{\mathbf{k}} \\
&= \kappa_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}}\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{h}}\rho_{\mathbf{k}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

This gives the consistency condition on $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$

$$\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}\kappa_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} = \kappa_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}}\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}. \tag{99}$$

We emphasize that the $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ transformation here may be anti-unitary, so that it applies complex conjugation (as well as the topological charge permutation) to the $\kappa_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}}$ which it conjugates.

Since we consider braided auto-equivalence maps to be equivalent when they are related by natural isomorphisms, we may equivalently choose to use the auto-equivalence maps $\check{\rho}_{\mathbf{g}} = \Upsilon_{\mathbf{g}} \circ \rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ for the global symmetry action. With this choice of action, we have the redefined quantities

$$\left[\check{U}_{\mathbf{g}}(a,b;c)\right]_{\mu\mu'} = \frac{\gamma_a(\mathbf{g})\gamma_b(\mathbf{g})}{\gamma_c(\mathbf{g})}\left[U_{\mathbf{g}}(a,b;c)\right]_{\mu\mu'}. \tag{100}$$

These result in a correspondingly redefined $\check{\kappa}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$, for which we may choose the redefined vertex decomposition factors

$$\check{\beta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \frac{\gamma_a(\mathbf{gh})}{K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\gamma_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}a}(\mathbf{h})K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\gamma_a(\mathbf{g})}\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}). \tag{101}$$

We emphasize that the transformation of the $F$-symbols and $R$-symbols are precisely the same for $\check{\rho}_{\mathbf{g}}$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$, since they are related by a natural isomorphism. In order to preserve the trivial action on the vacuum charge and the triviality of the factor $\beta_a(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) = 1$, we must fix $\gamma_0(\mathbf{g}) = \gamma_a(\mathbf{0}) = 1$. We may think of the relation between auto-equivalence maps by natural isomorphisms as a sort of gauge transformation for the symmetry action, which is a notion that will be made more clear in Sec. VI C.

### C. $H^3_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ Invariance Class of the Symmetry Action

Given the global symmetry action $[\rho]$ described in Sec. III B, we wish to find an invariant that would allow us to determine whether or not it would be possible to fractionalize the symmetry action. In this subsection, we will define such an invariant $[\mathfrak{O}] \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$, and in the following section, we will demonstrate that the symmetry can be fractionalized when $[\mathfrak{O}] = [0]$, whereas $[\mathfrak{O}] \neq [0]$ indicates that there is an obstruction to fractionalizing the symmetry. (See Appendix A for a review of group cohomology.)

We begin by defining (for a particular choice of $\rho \in [\rho]$) the quantity

$$\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = \frac{K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\beta_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})}{\beta_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}, \tag{102}$$

which is a phase from which we will obtain the desired invariant. From this definition, it immediately follows that

$$\frac{K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\Omega_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk},\mathbf{l})\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})}{\Omega_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{kl})} = 1. \tag{103}$$

By using Eqs. (91) and (99), we see that

$$\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\Omega_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = \Omega_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) \tag{104}$$

whenever $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$. As explained in the end of Sec. II B, this implies

$$\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = M^*_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})} \tag{105}$$

for some $\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}$ is the subset of topological charges in $\mathcal{C}$ that are Abelian. (One can also think of $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}$ as a subcategeory of $\mathcal{C}$.) More precisely, $\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) \in C^3(G,\mathcal{A})$ is a 3-cochain, since it is a function of three group elements $\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k} \in G$ to $\mathcal{A}$, which we can now consider to be the Abelian group whose elements are the Abelian topological charges of $\mathcal{C}$ with group multiplication given by their corresponding fusion rules. Moreover, through this relation, Eq. (103) maps to the condition

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= K^{q(\mathbf{g})} M_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}^{-1}}(a)\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})} K^{q(\mathbf{g})} M^*_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})} M_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk},\mathbf{l})} M^*_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{kl})} M_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})} \\ &= M_{a\rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})]} M^*_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})} M_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk},\mathbf{l})} M^*_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{kl})} M_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})} \\ &= M_{a\rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})]} M_{a\overline{\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})}} M_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk},\mathbf{l})} M_{a\overline{\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{kl})}} M_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})} \\ &= M_{a,\rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})]\times\overline{\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})}\times\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk},\mathbf{l})\times\overline{\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{kl})}\times\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})}, \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

Here, we used the symmetry property $S_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a)\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(b)} = K^{q(\mathbf{g})} S_{ab} K^{q(\mathbf{g})}$, the relation $S^*_{ab} = S_{a\bar{b}}$, and the fact that if $M_{ab}$ is a phase, then $M_{ab}M_{ac} = M_{ae}$ whenever $N_{bc}^e \neq 0$. Since this condition holds for all $a$, the non-degeneracy of braiding implies that

$$\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}) = \rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})] \times \overline{\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})} \times \mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk},\mathbf{l}) \times \overline{\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{kl})} \times \mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = 0. \tag{107}$$

In other words, $\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ satisfies the 3-cocycle condition, when treated as a 3-cochain. Thus, there is an invertible map between the phase $\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ and the 3-cocycle $\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) \in Z^3_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$.

As explained in the discussion around Eq. (92), there is gauge freedom to modify the phases $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ to $\breve{\beta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$, for phase factors $\nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ that satisfy $\nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\nu_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \nu_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ whenever $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$. The correspondingly modified

$$\begin{aligned} \breve{\Omega}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) &= \frac{K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\breve{\beta}_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}^{-1}}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\breve{\beta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})}{\breve{\beta}_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})\breve{\beta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \\ &= \frac{K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\nu_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}^{-1}}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})}{\nu_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})\nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) \end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

is to be considered in the same equivalence class as $\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ and obeys the same properties as $\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$, except $\breve{\Omega}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = M^*_{a\breve{\mathfrak{O}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})}$ maps to a potentially different $\breve{\mathfrak{O}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$, which should therefore be considered to be in the same equivalence class as $\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$. To find the relation between these, we note that we similarly have the condition that

$$\nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = M^*_{a\mathfrak{v}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}, \tag{109}$$

where $\mathfrak{v}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \in C^2(G,\mathcal{A})$ is a 2-cochain taking values in the set of Abelian topological charges. Using this in Eq. (108) and employing the same properties utilized in Eq. (106), we obtain the corresponding relation

$$\begin{aligned} \breve{\mathfrak{O}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) &= \rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{v}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})] \times \overline{\mathfrak{v}(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})} \\ &\quad \times \mathfrak{v}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}) \times \overline{\mathfrak{v}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \times \mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) \\ &= \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{v}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) \times \mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}), \end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

which shows that $\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ and $\breve{\mathfrak{O}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ in the same equivalence class are related by fusion with a 3-coboundary $\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{v}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) \in B^3_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$. Thus, the equivalence classes $[\mathfrak{O}]$ are elements of the 3rd cohomology group given by taking the quotient of 3-cocycles by 3-coboundaries

$$[\mathfrak{O}] \in H^3_\rho(G,\mathcal{A}) = \frac{Z^3_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})}{B^3_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})}. \tag{111}$$

We emphasize that the equivalence class $[\mathfrak{O}]$ is defined entirely in terms of $\rho$ (which defines $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$). We further emphasize that $[\mathfrak{O}] = [0]$ does not necessarily imply that $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\beta_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \beta_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ whenever $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$ nor, equivalently, that $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} = \mathbb{1}$.

We can also see from the definitions that the equivalence class $[\mathfrak{O}]$ is actually an invariant of the equivalence class $[\rho]$ of symmetry actions that are related by natural isomorphisms. In particular, if we instead used the action $\breve{\rho}_{\mathbf{g}} = \Upsilon_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$, where $\Upsilon_{\mathbf{g}}$ is a natural isomorphism, and the corresponding modified vertex decomposition factors $\breve{\beta}_a(\mathbf{g})$ as given in Eq. (101), then we would find that the corresponding quantity $\breve{\Omega}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = \Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ is unchanged. Thus, any such symmetry actions related by natural isomorphisms define the same equivalence class $[\breve{\mathfrak{O}}] = [\mathfrak{O}]$, so we actually have

$$[\mathfrak{O}] \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A}). \tag{112}$$

We note that if the symmetry action does not permute topological charges, i.e. $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a) = a$ for all $a$ and $\mathbf{g}$, then it is always the case that $[\mathfrak{O}] = [0]$. To demonstrate this property, we observe that $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ are actually natural isomorphisms when this is the case. It follows that we can write $[U_{\mathbf{g}}(a,b;c)]_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\chi_a(\mathbf{g})\chi_b(\mathbf{g})}{\chi_c(\mathbf{g})}\delta_{\mu\nu}$, where $\chi_a(\mathbf{g})$ are phases, and that we can make a choice within the equivalence class for

which $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \frac{\chi_a(\mathbf{gh})}{K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\chi_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}(a)}(\mathbf{h})K^{q(\mathbf{g})}\chi_a(\mathbf{g})}$. Using this with the definition, we find $\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = 1$ and hence $[\mathfrak{O}] = [0]$. (Alternatively, we could have used a gauge transformation to set $\rho = \mathbb{1}$, $U_{\mathbf{g}}(a,b;c)_{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu}$, and $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = 1$, which obviously gives $\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = 1$.)

Given $\mathcal{C}$ and $G$, there are many different possible choices of $\rho$. These different choices correspond to different ways that the global symmetry (of the microscopic Hamiltonian) and the topological order can interplay with each other. From the above discussion, we see that clearly the first important choice is how $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ permutes the various anyons. The next important choice depends on more subtle properties of the gauge transformations that are required when implementing $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$. In the next section, we examine how these properties lead to a concept known as symmetry fractionalization, whereby the quasiparticles have the ability to form a sort of projective representation of the symmetry group. We will classify the ways in which the symmetry can fractionalize and, in doing so, find that $[\mathfrak{O}] \neq [0]$ indicates that there is an obstruction to fractionalizing the symmetry.

## IV. SYMMETRY FRACTIONALIZATION

Before carrying out the detailed derivation, we will state the result of this section and provide a summary overview of the arguments (and direct the reader to Appendix A, if a review of group cohomology is needed):

For a system that realizes a topological phase described by the UMTC $\mathcal{C}$ and which has the global symmetry group $G$ with corresponding group action $[\rho] : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$:

1. There is an obstruction to symmetry fractionalization if $[\mathfrak{O}] \neq [0]$, where $[\mathfrak{O}] \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ was the invariant of $[\rho]$ defined in Sec. III C.

2. When $[\mathfrak{O}] = [0]$, symmetry fractionalization may occur and is classified by the cohomology group $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is defined to be the finite group whose elements are the Abelian topological charges of $\mathcal{C}$ with group multiplication given by their corresponding fusion rules. More precisely, the set of distinct symmetry fractionalization classes is an $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ torsor. [175]

In this section, we assume that the global symmetry acts in an on-site or "quasi-on-site" fashion on the underlying physical system, where quasi-on-site is a generalization of the notion of on-site that may include symmetries that act non-locally, such as anti-unitary, time-reversal, translation, rotation, and other spacetime symmetries. The on-site and quasi-on-site properties of symmetry actions are fundamental requirements for symmetry fractionalization, so we will define precisely what we mean when we use these terms. We do not restrict the symmetry group $G$ to be discrete.

In order to explain the above mathematical statement of symmetry fractionalization, we begin by examining the action of a unitary on-site symmetry on the physical Hilbert space of the underlying physical system and its microscopic Hamiltonian. We argue that the action of the global symmetry operator $R_{\mathbf{g}}$ on the physical states $|\Psi_{\{a_j\}}\rangle$, corresponding to the system with $n$ quasiparticles carrying topological charges $a_1,\ldots,a_n$, respectively, can always be written as

$$R_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi_{\{a_j\}}\rangle = \prod_{j=1}^{n} U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi_{\{a_j\}}\rangle. \tag{113}$$

Here we have separated local unitary transformations $U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$ from the non-local unitary transformation $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ that acts as the symmetry action on the topological quantum numbers.

Since $R_{\mathbf{g}}$ are the physical symmetry transformations, $R_{\mathbf{g}}R_{\mathbf{h}} = R_{\mathbf{gh}}$ (at least projectively). Writing out the localized forms explicitly leads to the relation

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n} U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}U_{\mathbf{h}}^{(j)}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} U_{\mathbf{gh}}^{(j)}\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}. \tag{114}$$

We can also argue that the local operators satisfy the projective multiplication relation acting on quasiparticle states

$$U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}U_{\mathbf{h}}^{(j)}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}|\Psi_{\{a_j\}}\rangle = \eta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})U_{\mathbf{gh}}^{(j)}|\Psi_{\{a_j\}}\rangle \tag{115}$$

for some phase factors $\eta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ that only depend on the topological charge $a_j$ and group elements $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{h}$. Then the condition $R_{\mathbf{g}}R_{\mathbf{h}} = R_{\mathbf{gh}}$ yields

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\beta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}{\eta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} = 1, \tag{116}$$

where $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ are the phase factors that decompose the natural isomorphism $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$, as in Sec. III B.

The associativity of the local operators leads to the cocycle-like relation

$$\frac{\eta_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})}{\eta_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} = 1. \tag{117}$$

This imposes a condition on $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ factors, which defines an obstruction given by the previously described invariance class $[\mathfrak{O}] \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$.

When the obstruction class is trivial, one is guaranteed to have at least one set of $\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ which can satisfy both Eq. (116) and Eq. (117). It follows that there are actually many solutions, since, given one solution with phase factors $\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$, another solution $\breve{\eta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})^{-1}\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ is obtained from it by dividing by phases $\tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ that satisfy the conditions

$$\frac{\tau_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})}{\tau_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})\tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} = 1, \tag{118}$$

$$\tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\tau_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \tau_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}), \quad \text{if} \quad N_{ab}^c \neq 0. \tag{119}$$

However, there is some redundancy in these solutions that is due to the freedom to redefine the operators $U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$ by local operators $Z_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$ that do not affect $R_{\mathbf{g}}$, which means $\prod_j Z_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} = \mathbb{1}$. This property requires that the action on quasiparticle state

$Z_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}|\Psi_{\{a_j\}}\rangle = \zeta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g})|\Psi_{\{a_j\}}\rangle$, where $\zeta_a(\mathbf{g})$ are phase that satisfy $\zeta_a(\mathbf{g})\zeta_b(\mathbf{g}) = \zeta_c(\mathbf{g})$ whenever $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$. This redefinition of local operators changes the phases $\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ in the following way

$$\breve{\eta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \frac{\zeta_a(\mathbf{gh})}{\zeta_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}(a)}(\mathbf{h})\zeta_a(\mathbf{g})}\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}). \tag{120}$$

Thus, if two sets solutions are related by such a transformation, they should be considered physically indistinguishable, so they belong to to a single equivalence class of solutions.

Since $\mathcal{C}$ is modular, the factors $\tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ uniquely define a 2-cocycle $\mathfrak{t} \in Z_\rho^2(G,\mathcal{A})$ and the factors $\zeta_a(\mathbf{g})$ uniquely define a 1-cochain $\mathfrak{z} \in C^1(G,\mathcal{A})$, which makes the equivalence classes related by 2-coboundaries $\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{z} \in B_\rho^2(G,\mathcal{A})$. Taking the quotient (and noting the invariance of the results under the choice of $\rho \in [\rho]$) results in the classification of solutions by $H_{[\rho]}^2(G,\mathcal{A})$.

After these arguments, we will generalize the results to the case where the global symmetry action is a projective representation. Finally, we will introduce the notion of quasi-on-site symmetry and explain how the on-site symmetry arguments and results are generalized to apply to such symmetries.

### A. Physical Manifestation of On-Site Global Symmetry

We wish to examine the quantum states of the underlying physical system in which there are quasiparticles present. Initially, let us consider the case when there are two quasiparticles, and we will subsequently generalize to an arbitrary number. We assume the two quasiparticles possess topological charges $a$ and $\bar{a}$, respectively, and that they are respectively localized within the well-separated, simply-connected regions $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$. Well-separated means that the minimum distance $r_{12} \equiv \min_{r_j \in \mathcal{R}_j} |r_1 - r_2|$ between any two points of the distinct regions is much larger than the correlation length $\xi$ of the system, i.e. $r_{12} \gg \xi$. (We typically think of $\mathcal{R}_j$ as a disk centered at the quasiparticle coordinate $r_j$ with a radius that is a few correlations lengths.)

For concreteness, we consider the system to be defined on a sphere (or any genus zero surface) and assume that there are no other quasiparticles nor boundaries that carry topological charge, so this pair must fuse to vacuum. (The analysis can be generalized to surfaces of arbitrary genus with any number of boundaries, but we will not do so in this paper.) In general, since $N_{a\bar{a}}^0 = 1$, there is a single topological sector in such a setup, which is described by $|a,\bar{a};0\rangle$ in the topological state space. However, this topological state represents a universality class of many microscopic states that share its topological properties and which differ by the application of local operators. Such a state in this universality class can be obtained by starting from the uniform Hamiltonian $H_0$ of the system in the topological phase, adiabatically creating a pair of quasiparticles with charges $a$ and $\bar{a}$ from vacuum by tuning the Hamiltonian to locally favor the existence of such quasiparticles that are not well-separated, and then subsequently moving the quasiparticles individually to regions $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$, respectively, through a sequence of similar modifications of the Hamiltonian (which return the Hamiltonian to its original form in the regions away from the quasiparticles positions).

The corresponding Hamiltonian resulting after this process is of the form

$$H_{a,\bar{a};0}^\alpha = H_0 + h_{a;\alpha}^{(1)} + h_{\bar{a};\alpha}^{(2)}, \tag{121}$$

where $h_{a;\alpha}^{(j)}$ is a modification of the Hamiltonian whose nontrivial action is localized within $\mathcal{R}_j$ and which favors the localization of a quasiparticle of charge $a$ in this region. The label $\alpha$ is a parameter which simply identifies these terms as one of many that favors localization of a quasiparticle of this type. We write the ground state of this Hamiltonian $H_{a,\bar{a};0}^\alpha$ as $|\Psi_{a,\bar{a};0}^\alpha\rangle$ (which is in the $|a,\bar{a};0\rangle$ universality class). We emphasize that $|\Psi_{a,\bar{a};0}^\alpha\rangle$ with different values of the parameter $\alpha$ are not necessarily orthogonal; in fact, we expect that they may have very high overlaps for some different values of $\alpha$. However, such states with different values of topological charge will be orthogonal, up to exponentially suppressed corrections, i.e. $\langle\Psi_{a,\bar{a};0}^\alpha|\Psi_{b,\bar{b};0}^\beta\rangle \approx 0$ whenever $a \neq b$.

Let us now assume that the symmetry acts on the system in an on-site manner, with $R_{\mathbf{g}}$ being the unitary operator representing the action of $\mathbf{g}$. By on-site, we mean that if we decompose the space manifold $\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{k\in I}\mathcal{M}_k$ into a collection of simply connected disjoint regions $\mathcal{M}_k$ (a subset of which can be taken to be the regions $\mathcal{R}_j$) with index set $I$, the symmetry operators take the form

$$R_{\mathbf{g}} = \prod_{k\in I} R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(k)}, \tag{122}$$

where $R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(k)}$ is a unitary operator that has nontrivial action localized in region $\mathcal{M}_k$. Since $\mathbf{g}$ is a symmetry of the system that acts on $\mathcal{C}$ by $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$, the Hamiltonians should transform as

$$R_{\mathbf{g}} H_0 R_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} = H_0 \tag{123}$$

$$R_{\mathbf{g}} H_{a,\bar{a};0}^\alpha R_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} = H_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}^{\mathbf{g}(\alpha)} \tag{124}$$

where

$$h_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a;\mathbf{g}(\alpha)}^{(j)} = R_{\mathbf{g}} h_{a;\alpha}^{(j)} R_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} \tag{125}$$

of the new Hamiltonian remains an operator that is localized in the region $\mathcal{R}_j$, but now favors the localization of a quasiparticle of charge ${}^{\mathbf{g}}a = \rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a)$. Indeed, since the symmetry is on-site, any operator $\mathcal{O}^{(j)}$ whose nontrivial action is localized in a region $\mathcal{R}_j$ remains localized in this region when acted upon by the symmetry transformation, i.e.

$${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{O}^{(j)} \equiv R_{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{O}^{(j)}R_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} = R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}\mathcal{O}^{(j)}R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)-1} \tag{126}$$

is localized in $\mathcal{R}_j$. We stress that the label $\mathbf{g}(\alpha)$ of the Hamiltonian defined with $h_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a;\mathbf{g}(\alpha)}^{(j)}$ obtained from the symmetry transformation indicates that this Hamiltonian need not equal the Hamiltonian defined with the modification $h_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a;\alpha}^{(j)}$ for localizing a charge ${}^{\mathbf{g}}a$ quasiparticle, to which we already ascribed

the label $\alpha$. In other words, while the universality class of states transforms as

$$|a,\bar{a};0\rangle \mapsto \rho_{\mathbf{g}}|a,\bar{a};0\rangle = U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0)|{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0\rangle \quad (127)$$

under the action of $\mathbf{g}$, the ground state of the Hamiltonian transforms as

$$|\Psi^{\alpha}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle \mapsto R_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi^{\alpha}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle = |\Psi^{\mathbf{g}(\alpha)}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}\rangle, \quad (128)$$

where $|\Psi^{\mathbf{g}(\alpha)}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}\rangle$ is not necessarily equal (nor proportional) to $|\Psi^{\alpha}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}\rangle$.

In fact, we have not yet made clear what it even means to have states $|\Psi^{\alpha}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle$ and $|\Psi^{\alpha}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}\rangle$ in different topological charge sectors with the same label $\alpha$. For this, we make a choice of complete orthonormal basis states $|\varphi^{s}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle$ for each topological charge sector. Then, given a state

$$|\Psi^{\alpha}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle = \sum_s A_s|\varphi^{s}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle \quad (129)$$

we identify the corresponding state in the different topological charge sector to be

$$|\Psi^{\alpha}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}\rangle = \sum_s A_s|\varphi^{s}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}\rangle. \quad (130)$$

We can now define the unitary operator $U_{\mathbf{g}}$ via the basis states of each subspace (with respect to which the operator is block diagonal)

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle\varphi^{r}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}|U_{\mathbf{g}}|\varphi^{s}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}\rangle \\ &\qquad = \langle\varphi^{r}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}|R_{\mathbf{g}}|\varphi^{s}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

This gives the relation

$$R_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi^{\alpha}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle = U_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi^{\alpha}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}\rangle \quad (132)$$

for any state $|\Psi^{\alpha}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle$ in the $|a,\bar{a};0\rangle$ universality class. We emphasize that $U_{\mathbf{g}}$ is independent of $\alpha$, but it does depend on the choice of basis, and simply provides the relation between the orthonormal basis given by the states $|\varphi^{s}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}\rangle$ and the orthonormal basis given by the states $R_{\mathbf{g}}|\varphi^{s}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle$.

Since the quasiparticles are localized at well-separated positions, the system has exponentially decaying correlations, and the system is locally uniform and symmetric away from the quasiparticles, the states in the $|a,\bar{a};0\rangle$ universality class will be locally indistinguishable from the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ of $H_0$ in (simply-connected) regions well-separated from the quasiparticles' $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$. More specifically, we expect that any two such states $|\Psi^{\alpha}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle$ and $|\Psi^{\beta}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle$ in this universality class can be related by unitary operators acting independently in regions $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$, i.e. there exist unitary operators $V^{(j)}$ whose nontrivial action is localized within $\mathcal{R}_j$ such that

$$|\Psi^{\beta}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle \approx V^{(1)}V^{(2)}|\Psi^{\alpha}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle. \quad (133)$$

The approximation in this expression is up to $O(e^{-r_{12}/\xi})$ corrections, which we will leave implicit in the following. [176]




FIG. 3: The global on-site symmetry action on states containing quasiparticles takes the form given in Eq. (139), where the global action $R_{\mathbf{g}}$ factorizes into the global symmetry action operator $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$, which acts only on the topological quantum numbers, and local transformations $U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}}$, each of which only acts nontrivially within a region $\mathcal{R}_j$ well-localized around the $j$th quasiparticle carrying topological charge $a_j$.

Thus, it follows that we can write the symmetry action as

$$R_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle = U^{(1)}_{\mathbf{g}}U^{(2)}_{\mathbf{g}}U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0)|\Psi_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}\rangle, \quad (134)$$

for any state $|\Psi_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle$ in the $|a,\bar{a};0\rangle$ universality class (we now drop the inconsequential label $\alpha$). In this expression, $U^{(1)}_{\mathbf{g}}$ and $U^{(2)}_{\mathbf{g}}$ are unitary operators whose nontrivial action is localized within $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$, respectively. The quantity $U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0)$ is precisely the transformation on the topological state space from Eqs. (85)-(90) that leaves the basic data invariant. In particular, $U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0)$ is an overall phase that depends only on the universality class of the state. Normally, one would safely ignore such an overall phase, but we include it here to match with the symmetry action on the topological degrees of freedom, as this will play an essential role in the subsequent generalization to $n$ quasiparticles. In this way, we have decomposed $U_{\mathbf{g}} = U^{(1)}_{\mathbf{g}}U^{(2)}_{\mathbf{g}}U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0)$ into terms that act locally around the quasiparticles and the term that acts on the topological state space. Clearly, $U^{(1)}_{\mathbf{g}}$ and $U^{(2)}_{\mathbf{g}}$ commute with each other, since their respective nontrivial actions are in two well-separated regions.

Given Eq. (134), we can define the operator

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}} = U^{(1)-1}_{\mathbf{g}}U^{(2)-1}_{\mathbf{g}}R_{\mathbf{g}} \quad (135)$$

acting on the physical Hilbert space that has the same action on states $|\Psi_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle$ in the $|a,\bar{a};0\rangle$ universality class as does the previously defined symmetry operator $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ ( see Sec. III B ) acting on $|a,\bar{a};0\rangle$ in the topological state space, i.e.

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle = U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0)|\Psi_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{g}}\bar{a};0}\rangle. \quad (136)$$

We note that, similar to $R_{\mathbf{g}}$, this operator also has the form $\rho_{\mathbf{g}} = \prod_{k\in I}\rho^{(k)}_{\mathbf{g}}$. [177]

We now generalize to consider the system in a configuration with $n$ quasiparticles with corresponding topological charges $a_j$ localized in well-separated regions $\mathcal{R}_j$ (for $j = 1,\ldots,n$), with corresponding Hamiltonians

$$H^{\alpha}_{a_1,\ldots,a_n;0} = H_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} h^{(j)}_{a_j;\alpha}. \quad (137)$$

The same steps can be followed as above, though one must be more careful to properly account for fusion degeneracies. In particular, there will be $N_{ab}^c$ distinct ways to create two quasiparticles with respective charges $a$ and $b$ from a single quasiparticle of topological charge $c$, and this will be reflected in the corresponding states and Hamiltonians. For a system with $n$ quasiparticles, the topological state space may be degenerate, with the dimensionality given by

$$N^0_{a_1\ldots a_n} = \sum_{c_{12},c_{123},\ldots,c_{1\ldots n-1}} N^{c_{12}}_{a_1a_2} N^{c_{123}}_{c_{12}a_3} \ldots N^0_{c_{1\ldots n-1}a_n}, \tag{138}$$

where here we use the standard basis decomposition of the topological state space where topological charges are fused together successively in increasing order of $j$, and $c_{1\ldots k}$ is the collective topological charge of quasiparticles $1,\ldots,k$. The states will correspondingly carry the labels $c_{12},\ldots,c_{1\ldots n-1}$, as well as the fusion space basis labels $\mu_{12},\ldots,\mu_{1\ldots n-1}$. (We can, of course, write the states in a different basis related by $F$-moves.) We write all these topological charges and fusion basis labels of the state collectively as $\{a;c,\mu\}$, with the understanding that the overall fusion channel of the $n$ quasiparticles is vacuum (i.e. $c_{1\ldots n}=0$), so we can more compactly write a state in this universality class as $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$. Following the same arguments given above, we find that the symmetry action on such states will take the form

$$R_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle = U^{(1)}_{\mathbf{g}}\ldots U^{(n)}_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle, \tag{139}$$

where the unitary operator $U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}}$ has its nontrivial action localized within $\mathcal{R}_j$. This is shown schematically in Fig. 3. (Again, the operators $U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}}$ depend on a choice of basis within the universality class, but not on the particular state it is acting upon.) Here, we use the generalized definition of the operator (in the physical Hilbert space)

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} U^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g}} R_{\mathbf{g}} \tag{140}$$

which acts on physical states $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ in the universality class $|\{a;c,\mu\}\rangle$ precisely as the operator $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ acts on states $|\{a;c,\mu\}\rangle$ in the topological state space. Explicitly, this is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle \;=\; & \sum_{\mu'_{12},\ldots,\mu'_{1\ldots n-1}} [U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}a_1,{}^{\mathbf{g}}a_2;{}^{\mathbf{g}}c_{12})]_{\mu_{12}\mu'_{12}}\,[U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}c_{12},{}^{\mathbf{g}}a_3;{}^{\mathbf{g}}c_{123})]_{\mu_{123}\mu'_{123}}\times\ldots \\ & \ldots\times[U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}c_{1\ldots n-2},{}^{\mathbf{g}}a_{n-1};{}^{\mathbf{g}}c_{1\ldots n-1})]_{\mu_{1\ldots n-1}\mu'_{1\ldots n-1}}\,U_{\mathbf{g}}({}^{\mathbf{g}}c_{1\ldots n-1},{}^{\mathbf{g}}a_n;0)|\Psi_{\{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a;{}^{\mathbf{g}}c,\mu'\}}\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{141}$$

Given the physical states containing quasiparticles and the symmetry transformations $R_{\mathbf{g}}$ acting upon them, one may use these expressions as a means of determining the global symmetry action $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ on the topological state space.

We can consider symmetry transformations taking the form in Eq. (139) when acting on states in the physical Hilbert space containing quasiparticles in a topological phase to be the fundamental condition from which the symmetry fractionalization arguments follow, regardless of the particular form of the Hamiltonian.

### B. Obstruction to Fractionalization

We will allow the global symmetry action to form either linear or projective representations of the symmetry group when acting on the physical Hilbert space, but first consider the case of linear representations of the global symmetry, and then return to the case of projective representations in Sec. IV E. For linear representations, the symmetry operators will satisfy $R_{\mathbf{gh}} = R_{\mathbf{g}}R_{\mathbf{h}}$. However, the local operators $U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}}$ can nonetheless take a projective form, and we wish to classify the types of projective forms that they can realize. We compare the action of $\mathbf{gh}$, which is given by

$$\begin{aligned}R_{\mathbf{gh}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle \;&=\; \prod_{j=1}^{n} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{gh}}\rho_{\mathbf{gh}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle \\ &=\; \prod_{j=1}^{n} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{gh}}\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{h}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle,\end{aligned} \tag{142}$$

where $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} = \rho_{\mathbf{gh}}\rho_{\mathbf{h}}^{-1}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}$ (as in Sec. III B), and the successive actions of $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{h}$, which is given by

$$\begin{aligned}R_{\mathbf{g}}R_{\mathbf{h}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle &= R_{\mathbf{g}}\prod_{j=1}^{n} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}}\rho_{\mathbf{h}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle \\ &= R_{\mathbf{g}}\prod_{j=1}^{n} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}}R^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}}R_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{h}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle \\ &= R_{\mathbf{g}}\prod_{j=1}^{n} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}}R^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}}\prod_{k=1}^{n} U^{(k)}_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{h}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{n} {}^{\mathbf{g}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{h}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle,\end{aligned} \tag{143}$$

where ${}^{\mathbf{g}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}} = R_{\mathbf{g}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}}R^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}} = R^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}}R^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g}}$ has its nontrivial action localized within the region $\mathcal{R}_j$, and we used the

fact that operators whose nontrivial actions are localized in different regions commute with each other. Comparing these expressions, we see that

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n} U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)-1\ \mathbf{g}} U_{\mathbf{h}}^{(j)-1} U_{\mathbf{gh}}^{(j)} \kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} = \mathbb{1} \tag{144}$$

when acting in the subspace of states of the form $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ corresponding to the system with $n$ quasiparticles. We note that

$${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{O}^{(j)} U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} = U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}} \mathcal{O}^{(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}, \tag{145}$$

for any operator $\mathcal{O}^{(j)}$ localized in $\mathcal{R}_j$, so we could rewrite these expressions using $U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}} U_{\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}$ instead of ${}^{\mathbf{g}}U_{\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$, if desired.

Since the action of $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ on the physical states of the form $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ is precisely the same as the action of $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ on the states $|\{a;c,\mu\}\rangle$ in the topological state space, we know that the action of $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ on physical states of the form $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ also matches the action of $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ in the topological state space, and thus takes the form

$$\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle, \tag{146}$$

where $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ are the phases defined in Sec. III B that depends only on the topological charge value $a$, and group elements $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{h}$. Let us define a unitary operator $B_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)}$ localized in region $\mathcal{R}_j$ whose action on a quasiparticle state produces the phase $\beta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ of the topological charge contained in the region $\mathcal{R}_j$, that is [178]

$$B_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle = \beta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle. \tag{147}$$

We can now define the unitary operators

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} &= U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)-1\ \mathbf{g}} U_{\mathbf{h}}^{(j)-1} U_{\mathbf{gh}}^{(j)} B_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} \\ &= \rho_{\mathbf{g}} U_{\mathbf{h}}^{(j)-1} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)-1} U_{\mathbf{gh}}^{(j)} B_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)}. \end{aligned} \tag{148}$$

Since the $U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$ and $B_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)}$ are all unitary operators with nontrivial action localized within the region $\mathcal{R}_j$, this is also true for $W_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)}$. From the above relations, we see that

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n} W_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} = \mathbb{1} \tag{149}$$

when acting in the subspace of $n$ quasiparticles states of the form $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$, for any values of $\{a;c,\mu\}$.

Since the respective regions $\mathcal{R}_j$ where $W_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)}$ act nontrivially are well-separated from each other, each one of these operators can, at most, change a state of the form $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ by an overall phase factor. Hence, we have

$$\langle \Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}} | W_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} | \Psi_{\{b;e,\nu\}} \rangle = \omega_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \delta_{\{a;c,\mu\}\{b;e,\nu\}}, \tag{150}$$

where the phase $\omega_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ only depends on the topological charge $a_j$ contained in the region $\mathcal{R}_j$.

In order to see that the phases $\omega_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ do not depend on anything else, we first note that the phase factor can obviously depend, at most, on the group elements $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{h}$, and the properties of the state $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ that are local to the region $\mathcal{R}_j$. In order to see that the only property of the state that the phase depends on is the topological charge contained in the region $\mathcal{R}_j$, we must show that the phase is actually independent of the specific state $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ taken from the $|\{a;c,\mu\}\rangle$ universality class. For this, assume that the phase may depend on the specific state, which we indicate by writing it as $\omega(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h};\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}})$. Then consider any two orthonormal states $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}^{\alpha}\rangle$ and $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}^{\beta}\rangle$ from this universality class, and their normalized superposition $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}^{\gamma}\rangle = C_\alpha |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}^{\alpha}\rangle + C_\beta |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}^{\beta}\rangle$. The above expression yields the relation

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h};\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}^{\gamma}) &= |C_\alpha|^2 \omega(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h};\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}^{\alpha}) \\ &\quad + |C_\beta|^2 \omega(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h};\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}^{\beta}) \end{aligned} \tag{151}$$

which can only be true for arbitrary $C_\alpha$ and $C_\beta$ if

$$\omega(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h};\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}^{\gamma}) = \omega(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h};\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}^{\alpha}) = \omega(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h};\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}^{\beta}) \tag{152}$$

which shows that the phase is the same for all states in the universality class. Since the only universal property of the state that is local to the region $\mathcal{R}_j$ is the topological charge $a_j$ contained in that region, this establishes the claimed dependence of the phase.

It follows that, within the subspace of states of the form $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$, the operators $W_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)}$, $W_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}^{(j)}$, $B_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)}$, and $B_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}^{(j)}$ all commute with each other. It also follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) U_{\mathbf{gh}}^{(j)} |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle &= U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}} U_{\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle \\ &= {}^{\mathbf{g}}U_{\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{153}$$

where the projective phases are given by

$$\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \frac{\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}{\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}. \tag{154}$$

Eq. (153) exhibits a characteristic property of symmetry fractionalization, which is that the action of the symmetry can be broken up into topological and local actions, where the local actions are locally consistent in a projective fashion. Of course, the topological action is topologically consistent, and the local and topological actions must also be consistent with each other. For this, we have already decomposed the consistency of the topological action into terms $\beta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ that only depend on the localized topological charge values, and must now examine the phases $\omega_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ to analyze the consistency of the interplay between the local and topological actions of the symmetry.

It is clear that we should have

$$\eta_0(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = 1, \tag{155}$$

since the symmetry action on the ground state is trivial (and any region $\mathcal{R}_j$ containing total topological charge $a_j = 0$ can be locally transformed into the ground state). Additionally, we will always fix

$$\eta_a(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) = \eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0}) = \eta_a(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{h}) = 1, \tag{156}$$

since we can always freely set $U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{0}} = \mathbb{1}$ as a gauge choice, which we will describe in more detail in Sec. IV C. It follows that we also have $\omega_a(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) = \omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0}) = \omega_a(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{h}) = 1$.

Given Eq. (149), the phases $\omega_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ must obey the constraint

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n} \omega_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = 1. \tag{157}$$

We emphasize that this does not mean that the product of the phases $\prod_{j=1}^{n} \eta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ is equal to 1, nor that the product of the phases $\prod_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ is equal to 1. These products would only individually equal 1 when $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} = \mathbb{1}$, which is not generally true (though, this condition is often satisfied by examples of physical interest).

Considering the case of $n = 2$ quasiparticles with respective topological charges $a$ and $\bar{a}$, we find the relation

$$\omega_{\bar{a}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})^{-1}. \tag{158}$$

Considering the case of $n = 3$ quasiparticles, with respective topological charges $a$, $b$, and $\bar{c}$, for which $N^c_{ab} \neq 0$, and using the result from the $n = 2$ case, we find the relation

$$\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\omega_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \omega_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \tag{159}$$

for any charges $a$, $b$, and $c$ with $N^c_{ab} \neq 0$. Thus, as explained at the end of Sec. II B, the phase factors are given by

$$\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = M^*_{a\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}, \tag{160}$$

for some Abelian topological charge value $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \in \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}$.

It also follows from Eqs. (154) and (159) that

$$\frac{\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\eta_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}{\eta_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} = \frac{\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\beta_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}{\beta_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} = \kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(a,b;c) \tag{161}$$

whenever $N^c_{ab} \neq 0$.

Next, we consider the product of three symmetry operations and apply the relation $U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{gh}} = {}^{\mathbf{g}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ in the two distinct, but equivalent orders to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{ghk}} &= {}^{\mathbf{gh}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{k}} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{gh}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}} \\
&= {}^{\mathbf{gh}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{k}} {}^{\mathbf{g}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}} \\
&= {}^{\mathbf{g}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{hk}} U_{\mathbf{g}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}} \\
&= {}^{\mathbf{gh}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{k}} {}^{\mathbf{g}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}} {}^{\mathbf{g}}W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}} {}^{\mathbf{g}}B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}} \\
&= {}^{\mathbf{gh}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{k}} {}^{\mathbf{g}}U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}} \rho_{\mathbf{g}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}} \rho^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}} \rho_{\mathbf{g}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}} \rho^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{162}$$

This gives the relation

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}} \rho^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}} \rho_{\mathbf{g}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}} \rho^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}} = W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}} B^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}}, \tag{163}$$

which, when applied to a state $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$, yields the crucial relation

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) &= \beta_{\rho^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\beta_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})^{-1}\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})^{-1} \\
&= \omega_{\rho^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\omega_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})^{-1}\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})^{-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{164}$$

where we use the definition of $\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ from Sec. III C. This relation is equivalent to the condition

$$\eta_{\rho^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\eta_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})^{-1}\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})^{-1} = 1 \tag{165}$$

on the projective phases of the local terms, which is a sort of twisted 2-cocycle condition. From this, one might naïvely expect a classification of fractionalization by $H^2(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$, however the relation to $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ and $\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ impose additional constraints that further restrict the classification, as we will now describe.

Using $\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = M^*_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})}$ and $\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = M^*_{a\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}$, where $\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) \in Z^3_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \in C^2(G,\mathcal{A})$ are Abelian topological charges, together with the relation $S^*_{ab} = S_{a\bar{b}}$ and the symmetry property $S_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a)\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(b)} = S_{ab}$, this becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})} &= M_{a\rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})]} M^*_{a\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})} M_{a\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})} M^*_{a\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \\
&= M_{a\rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})]} M_{a\overline{\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})}} M_{a\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})} M_{a\overline{\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}} \\
&= M_{a,\rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})]\times\overline{\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})}\times\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})\times\overline{\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{166}$$

In the last line, we used the fact that if $M_{ab}$ is a phase and $N_{bc}^{e} \neq 0$, then it follows that $M_{ab}M_{ac} = M_{ae}$. Finally, the non-degeneracy of braiding in a MTC makes this equivalent to the condition

$$\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = \rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})] \times \overline{\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})} \times \mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}) \times \overline{\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} = \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}). \tag{167}$$

Thus, we have found that consistency between the local and topological portions of the symmetry action requires that $\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ is necessarily a 3-coboundary, which is to say that $\mathfrak{O} \in B^3_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$ and its equivalence class is $[\mathfrak{O}] = [0]$. This establishes the first statement regarding symmetry fractionalization, which was that $[\mathfrak{O}] \neq [0]$ indicates that there is an obstruction to fractionalizing the symmetry, since this would contradict the result in Eq. (167). In particular, such an obstruction implies that it is not actually possible for the symmetry of the system to take the assumed on-site form of Eq. (122) with the corresponding action on quasiparticle states given in Eq. (139), as the symmetry action cannot be consistently split into local and topological components.

We can also view $\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ as a particular choice of the $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(a,b;c)$ decomposition factors, i.e. $\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \breve{\beta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ with $\nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$, such that Eq. (165) is satisfied. From this perspective, the obstruction class $[\mathfrak{O}]$ indicates whether or not such a choice is possible.

When the symmetry action does not permute topological charge values, one can interpret Eq. (153) as indicating that the local operators $U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$ provide projective representations of the group $G$.

### C. Gauge Transformations

There is gauge freedom to redefine the local operators $U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$ by the local transformations

$$\breve{U}_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} = U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} Y_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)-1} \tag{168}$$

where $Y_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$ are unitary operators whose nontrivial action is localized in region $\mathcal{R}_j$. In order to leave the global operator $R_{\mathbf{g}}$ unchanged, there must be a corresponding transformation of the symmetry action operator

$$\breve{\rho}_{\mathbf{g}} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} Y_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}. \tag{169}$$

In order for this operator to again act on the physical states with quasiparticles as does a symmetry action on the topological state space, we require it to only depend on the topological quantum numbers (and the group element $\mathbf{g}$). Since $Y_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$ acts locally in region in the region $\mathcal{R}_j$, the only topological quantum number it can depend upon is the topological charge $a_j$ in that region. Thus, we must have

$$\langle \Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}} | Y_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} | \Psi_{\{b;e,\nu\}} \rangle = \gamma_{a_j}(\mathbf{g}) \delta_{\{a;c,\mu\}\{b;e,\nu\}}, \tag{170}$$

where $\gamma_{a_j}(\mathbf{g})$ is some phase factor that depends only on the topological charge $a_j$ and the group element $\mathbf{g}$. Of course, the notation we used here anticipated the fact that these gauge transformations have precisely the form of natural isomorphisms, as described in Sec. III by

$$\breve{\rho}_{\mathbf{g}} = \Upsilon_{\mathbf{g}} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}, \tag{171}$$

with corresponding decomposition into the phase factors $\gamma_a(\mathbf{g})$ when acting on fusion vertex states.

We notice that, under these transformations, the projective phases transform as

$$\breve{\eta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \frac{\gamma_a(\mathbf{gh})}{\gamma_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}a}(\mathbf{h})\gamma_a(\mathbf{g})} \eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}). \tag{172}$$

For the choice of

$$\breve{\beta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \frac{\gamma_a(\mathbf{gh})}{\gamma_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}a}(\mathbf{h})\gamma_a(\mathbf{g})} \beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}), \tag{173}$$

as in Eq. (101), this exactly cancels to leave $\breve{\omega}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ unchanged. As previously mentioned, it also leaves $\breve{\Omega}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = \Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ and hence $\breve{\mathfrak{O}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = \mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ unchanged.

In this way, the nontrivial transformations of these quantities are relegated to the transformations

$$\breve{\beta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}), \tag{174}$$

where $\nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\nu_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \nu_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ whenever $N_{ab}^{c} \neq 0$, corresponding to the freedom of decomposing the action of $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ on vertices into factors $\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$. These transformations give $\breve{\omega}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$, while $\breve{\Omega}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ and $\breve{\mathfrak{O}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})$ are given in Eqs. (108) and (110).

### D. Classification of Symmetry Fractionalization

We now wish to classify the different ways in which the symmetry can fractionalize, when there is no obstruction. For this, we must analyze the solutions of Eq. (167) for a given $\rho$ and $\mathfrak{O}$.

Since $[\mathfrak{O}] = [0]$, there must exist some $\mathfrak{v}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \in C^2(G,\mathcal{A})$ such that $\mathfrak{O} = \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{v}$. This is just the equivalence class statement that one can use the gauge transformation in Eq. (174) for some $\nu_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = M^*_{a\mathfrak{v}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}$ which results in $\breve{\Omega}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = 1$ and $\breve{\mathfrak{O}} = 0$. Thus, we are guaranteed to have at least one solution of Eq. (167) given by $\mathfrak{w} = \mathfrak{v}$.

Given a solution $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ of Eq. (167), it is straightforward to see that another solution

$$\mathfrak{w}'(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \times \mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \tag{175}$$

can be obtained from it by multiplying by a 2-cocycle $\mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \in Z^2_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$. In fact, it should be clear that all solutions of Eq. (167) may be obtained from any given solution in this way.

This way of obtaining different solutions can be thought of as utilizing transformations like those in Eq. (174), given by $\beta'_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$, where $\tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ are phases that satisfy the condition that $\tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\tau_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \tau_c(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ whenever $N^c_{ab} \neq 0$, but which are also required to satisfy the additional condition

$$\tau_{\mathbf{g}a}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}) = \tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\tau_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}). \tag{176}$$

Alternatively, one may think of this as similarly modifying the local phase factors $\eta'_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \tau_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})^{-1}\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$, as the two notions are not really distinguishable in this context.

There is, however, a sense in which different solutions $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ should be considered equivalent. In particular, if we locally redefine the operators $U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}}$ by a transformation

$$\breve{U}^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}} = U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}} Z^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g}}, \tag{177}$$

where $Z^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}}$ are unitary operators whose nontrivial action is localized within $\mathcal{R}_j$, this redefinition will not change the global action $R_{\mathbf{g}}$ on states as long as these operators satisfy

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n} Z^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}} = \mathbb{1} \tag{178}$$

when acting in the subspace of quasiparticle states of the form $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$. These are gauge transformations, and so they should be treated as trivial modifications of the operators $U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}}$, i.e. all operators related by such a transformation are in the same equivalence class.

By similar arguments as used for $W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$, it follows from Eq. (178) that

$$\langle\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}|Z^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi_{\{b;e,\nu\}}\rangle = \zeta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g})\delta_{\{a;c,\mu\}\{b;e,\nu\}}, \tag{179}$$

where $\zeta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g})$ is a phase that only depends on the topological charge $a_j$ contained in the region $\mathcal{R}_j$ and that these phases obey the constraint

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n} \zeta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g}) = 1. \tag{180}$$

This similarly leads to the property that $\zeta_a(\mathbf{g})\zeta_b(\mathbf{g}) = \zeta_c(\mathbf{g})$ whenever $N^c_{ab} \neq 0$, which, in turn, gives the relation

$$\zeta_a(\mathbf{g}) = M^*_{a\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{g})}, \tag{181}$$

for some Abelian topological charge $\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{g}) \in C^1(G,\mathcal{A})$. These are precisely the same redundancies that arose due to the freedom to decompose the trivial natural isomorphism into topological charge dependent phase factors, as described in Sec. III.

Under such transformations, the operators $W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ transform into

$$\begin{aligned}\breve{W}^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} &= Z^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}} U^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g}}\, {}^{\mathbf{g}}Z^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}}\, {}^{\mathbf{g}}U^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{h}} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{gh}} Z^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{gh}} B^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} \\ &= Z^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}} \rho_{\mathbf{g}} Z^{(j)}_{\mathbf{h}} \rho^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}} W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} Z^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{gh}}.\end{aligned} \tag{182}$$

Acting on states of the form $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$, this produces the equivalent relations

$$\breve{\omega}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \frac{\zeta_{\rho^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}}(a)}(\mathbf{h})\zeta_a(\mathbf{g})}{\zeta_a(\mathbf{gh})}\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}), \tag{183}$$

$$\begin{aligned}M_{a\breve{\mathfrak{w}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} &= M_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{h})]} M^*_{a\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{gh})} M_{a\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{g})} M_{a\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \\ &= M_{a,\rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{h})]\times\overline{\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{gh})}\times\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{g})\times\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}\end{aligned} \tag{184}$$

from which we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\breve{\mathfrak{w}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) &= \rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{h})] \times \overline{\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{gh})} \times \mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{g}) \times \mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \\ &= \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \times \mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}),\end{aligned} \tag{185}$$

showing that $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ and $\breve{\mathfrak{w}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ that are related by fusion with a 2-coboundary $\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \in B^2_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$ correspond precisely to operators $W^{(i)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ and $\breve{W}^{(i)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ that are related by gauge transformations, and so should be considered equivalent, i.e. one should take the quotient by $B^2_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$.

Thus, the solutions of Eq. (167) for the $[\mathfrak{O}] = [0]$ equivalence class are classified by

$$[\mathfrak{t}] \in H^2_\rho(G,\mathcal{A}) = \frac{Z^2_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})}{B^2_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})}. \tag{186}$$

One should not, however, think of the set of solutions itself as being equal to $H^2_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$, but rather an $H^2_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$ torsor. In particular, the distinct cohomology classes $[\mathfrak{t}] \in H^2_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$ relate distinct equivalence classes of solutions $[\mathfrak{w}]$, with different solutions being related by $\mathfrak{w}'(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \times \mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$. The number of distinct symmetry fractionalization classes is thus equal to $|H^2_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})|$. In this sense, there is no notion of an identity element of the set of solutions (as might have naïvely seemed to be the case had one chosen to use the representative $\mathfrak{O} = 0$ of the $[\mathfrak{O}] = [0]$ equivalence class). When $\mathfrak{O} = 0$, Eq. (167) becomes a cocycle condition on $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$, so, in this case, the equivalence classes of solutions are actually cohomology classes $[\mathfrak{w}] \in H^2_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$, though this is not an invariant statement.

Once again, symmetry actions in the same equivalence class related by natural isomorphisms lead to the same results here, so this classification of solutions is actually independent of the choice $\rho \in [\rho]$. Thus, the symmetry fractionalization is classified by

$$[\mathfrak{t}] \in H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A}). \tag{187}$$

### E. Projective Representations of the Global Symmetry

In the above discussion, we assumed that the local Hilbert space on each site transforms in a linear representation of the

global symmetry $G$. However this is not fully general, and it is possible that instead the local Hilbert space on each site transforms according to a projective representation of $G$. The canonical example is a spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ system. While the global symmetry of spin rotation is $G = \mathrm{SO}(3)$, each site contains a spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ which transforms in a projective representation of $\mathrm{SO}(3)$. Describing symmetry fractionalization when the local Hilbert space already forms a projective representation of $G$ requires some minor modifications of the previous arguments. In particular, the action of a projective symmetry representation on the ground state will take the form

$$R_{\mathbf{gh}}|\Psi_0\rangle = e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}} R_{\mathbf{g}} R_{\mathbf{h}} |\Psi_0\rangle, \tag{188}$$

where $e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}}$ are the projective representation phase factors. The projective representations are classified by $H^2\left(G, \mathrm{U}(1)\right)$. In particular, the phases $e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}}$ must satisfy the 2-cocycle condition

$$e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}}} e^{-i\Phi_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}}} e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}}} e^{-i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}} = 1 \tag{189}$$

in order for the two different, but equivalent ways of relating $R_{\mathbf{ghk}}$ and $R_{\mathbf{g}} R_{\mathbf{h}} R_{\mathbf{k}}$ to be consistent. Additionally, different projective phase factors $e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}}$ and $e^{i\tilde{\Phi}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}}$ are considered equivalent if they are related by a 2-coboundary

$$e^{i\tilde{\Phi}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}} = e^{if_{\mathbf{h}}} e^{-if_{\mathbf{gh}}} e^{if_{\mathbf{g}}} e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}} \tag{190}$$

for some phase function $e^{if_{\mathbf{g}}}$ of the group elements of $G$, since their difference could simply be absorbed into the operator $R_{\mathbf{g}}$ by the trivial redefinition $\tilde{R}_{\mathbf{g}} = e^{if_{\mathbf{g}}} R_{\mathbf{g}}$. The equivalence class $[e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}}] \in H^2\left(G, \mathrm{U}(1)\right)$ of the projective representation is a global property of the system that does not change under application of local operations, such as those that create quasiparticles. Thus, we also have

$$R_{\mathbf{gh}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle = e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}} R_{\mathbf{g}} R_{\mathbf{h}} |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle \tag{191}$$

with the same $e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}}$ for any state of the form $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ obtainable from the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ through adiabatic creation and manipulation of quasiparticles. We now define $W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ as before for $j = 2, \ldots, n$, while for $j = 1$ we slightly modify the definition to be

$$W^{(1)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} = e^{-i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}} U^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g}} {}^{\mathbf{g}}U^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{h}} U^{(j)}_{\mathbf{gh}} B^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}. \tag{192}$$

With this definition, we retain the properties that $W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ is localized in region $\mathcal{R}_j$, and that the $W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ satisfy Eqs. (149) and (150). This allows the argument relating the eigenvalues of $W^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ to Abelian topological charges to go through unaltered. To see that the cocycle relations are unchanged, we only need to check that Eq. (163) remains the same for $W^{(1)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$. This follows from the previous argument, together with the fact that $e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}}$ itself satisfies the 2-cocycle condition of Eq. (189). Thus, the same cohomological relations hold and all the arguments go through as before to give the same results for obstruction and classification of symmetry fractionalization.

### F. Quasi-On-Site Global Symmetry

There are a number of symmetries, such as time-reversal symmetry and translation symmetry, that do not act in an on-site fashion, but which may nonetheless be fractionalized. In order to understand fractionalization of such symmetries, we must generalize the notion of symmetries acting in an on-site fashion so as to include the possibility of anti-unitary symmetries and other nonlocal symmetries.

Let us again decompose the space manifold $\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{k\in I} \mathcal{M}_k$ into a collection of simply connected disjoint regions $\mathcal{M}_k$ (a subset of which can be taken to be the regions $\mathcal{R}_j$) with index set $I$.

We call a symmetry operator "quasi-on-site" if it takes the form

$$R_{\mathbf{g}} = \prod_{k\in I} R^{(k)}_{\mathbf{g}} P_{\mathbf{g}}, \tag{193}$$

where $R^{(k)}_{\mathbf{g}}$ is a unitary operator that has nontrivial action localized in region $\mathcal{M}_k$, and $P_{\mathbf{g}}$ is a unitary or anti-unitary operator that preserves locality in the following sense: For any operator $\mathcal{O}^{(j)}$ localized in the simply connected region $\mathcal{R}_j$, the operator

$$\mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{g}(j)} \equiv P_{\mathbf{g}} \mathcal{O}^{(j)} P^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}} \tag{194}$$

is localized in the (possibly distinct) simply connected region that we denote as ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_j$, and two such simply connected regions $\mathcal{R}_j$ and $\mathcal{R}_k$ are disjoint, i.e. $\mathcal{R}_j \cap \mathcal{R}_k = \emptyset$, if and only if the corresponding regions ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_j$ and ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_k$ are disjoint, i.e. ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_j \cap {}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_k = \emptyset$.

Specific examples that we have in mind for the operator $P_{\mathbf{g}}$ are the complex conjugation operator $K$, in which case ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_j = \mathcal{R}_j$, or a translation operator $T_{\vec{x}}$ (in a translationally invariant system), in which case ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_j$ is the region $\mathcal{R}_j$ translated by the vector $\vec{x}$. Clearly, on-site symmetries have $P_{\mathbf{g}} = \mathbb{1}$.

We can now repeat the entire analysis of this section with a few small, but important modifications to account for the quasi-on-site generalization. We note that our treatment here requires that the symmetries also leave the spatial orientation of the fusion/splitting spaces invariant. Consequently, we omit spatial symmetries involving rotations or parity.

The first modification is to the conjugation of local operators by $R_{\mathbf{g}}$. In particular, given the above locality preserving property of $P_{\mathbf{g}}$, we generalize the definition in Eq. (126) to

$${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{O}^{(j)} \equiv R_{\mathbf{g}} \mathcal{O}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(j)} R^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}} = R^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g}} P_{\mathbf{g}} \mathcal{O}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(j)} P^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}} R^{(j)-1}_{\mathbf{g}}, \tag{195}$$

which is thus an operator whose nontrivial action is localized in the region $\mathcal{R}_j$.

The next modification is that when the $j$th quasiparticle of the state $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ is localized in region $\mathcal{R}_j$, it follows that the $j$th quasiparticle of the state $R_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ is localized in the region ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_j$. Consequently, the action of $R_{\mathbf{g}}$ on states in the physical Hilbert space containing quasiparticles, as in Eq. (139), is modified to

$$R_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle = U^{\mathbf{g}(1)}_{\mathbf{g}} \ldots U^{\mathbf{g}(n)}_{\mathbf{g}} \rho_{\mathbf{g}} |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle, \tag{196}$$




FIG. 4: The action of a global quasi-on-site symmetry operator $R_{\mathbf{g}}$ on a state with quasiparticles may move the locations where the quasiparticles are localized, from the regions $\mathcal{R}_j$ to the regions ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_j$. The quasi-on-site property ensures that the regions ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_j$ are mutually disjoint for distinct $j$ whenever the regions $\mathcal{R}_j$ are mutually disjoint for distinct $j$. Additionally, the quasi-on-site symmetry action induces unitary transformations $U_{\mathbf{g}}^{\mathbf{g}(j)}$ that are, respectively, localized in the regions ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_j$, together with a global transformation $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ which strictly acts on the topological quantum numbers.

where $U_{\mathbf{g}}^{\mathbf{g}(j)}$ is a unitary operator whose nontrivial action is localized in the region ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_j$, and we have defined $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ exactly as before, which now makes it a quasi-on-site operator, in accord with $R_{\mathbf{g}}$. In particular,

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} U_{\mathbf{g}}^{\mathbf{g}(j)-1} R_{\mathbf{g}}, \tag{197}$$

and it also follows that $\rho_{\mathbf{g}} = \prod_{k\in I} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{(k)} P_{\mathbf{g}}$. We can leave Eq. (141) unmodified, with the understanding that if the $j$th quasiparticle of the state $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ is localized is region $\mathcal{R}_j$, then the $j$th quasiparticle of the state $|\Psi_{\{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a;{}^{\mathbf{g}}c,\mu'\}}\rangle$ (and the state $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$) is localized in the region ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{R}_j$. It is also important to emphasize that now $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ includes the action of $P_{\mathbf{g}}$, so, in addition to potentially modifying the localization regions, it will complex conjugate coefficients in front of the state whenever $\mathbf{g}$ corresponds to an anti-unitary symmetry.

With these modifications, one must be careful to modify the localization regions of the operators appropriately in all steps of the arguments of the previous sections, but, in the end, this dependence drops out entirely. In particular, we note that we should modify Eq. (145) to

$${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathcal{O}^{(j)} U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} = U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}} \mathcal{O}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}, \tag{198}$$

the definition of the operator $W_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)}$, which has its nontrivial action localized in the region $\mathcal{R}_j$, to

$$W_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} = U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)-1\,\mathbf{g}} U_{\mathbf{h}}^{(j)-1} U_{\mathbf{gh}}^{(j)} B_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} = \rho_{\mathbf{g}} U_{\mathbf{h}}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(j)-1} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)-1} U_{\mathbf{gh}}^{(j)} B_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)}, \tag{199}$$

and the relation of Eq. (153) to

$$\eta_{a_j}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) U_{\mathbf{gh}}^{(j)} |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle = {}^{\mathbf{g}}U_{\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle = U_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}} U_{\mathbf{h}}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} |\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle. \tag{200}$$

The final relation in terms of operators, given in Eq. (163), is modified to

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}} W_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(j)} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} \rho_{\mathbf{g}} B_{\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}(j)-1} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1} W_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}}^{(j)} B_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}}^{(j)-1} = W_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)} B_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}^{(j)-1} W_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}}^{(j)} B_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}}^{(j)-1}. \tag{201}$$

Applying this relation to a state $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$, we find that the dependence on localization regions drops out of the resulting relation in terms of (eigenvalue) phases, and the only modification that we must now account for is the potential complex conjugation due to $\mathbf{g}$ being an anti-unitary symmetry (which was encoded in the operator $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$). Specifically, this yields the modification of Eq. (164) to the relation

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) &= K^{q(\mathbf{g})} \beta_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) K^{q(\mathbf{g})} \beta_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})^{-1} \beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}) \beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})^{-1} \\ &= K^{q(\mathbf{g})} \omega_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) K^{q(\mathbf{g})} \omega_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})^{-1} \omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}) \omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})^{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{202}$$

and the modification of Eq. (165) to

$$K^{q(\mathbf{g})} \eta_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}(a)}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) K^{q(\mathbf{g})} \eta_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})^{-1} \eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}) \eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})^{-1} = 1. \tag{203}$$

Using $\Omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = M^*_{a\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})}$ and $\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = M^*_{a\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}$ exactly as before, though with the relation $S_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a)\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(b)} = K^{q(\mathbf{g})} S_{ab} K^{q(\mathbf{g})}$ that applies for unitary and anti-unitary sym-

metries, we obtain precisely the same consistency condition

$$\mathfrak{O}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) \tag{204}$$

of Eq. (167). We emphasize that the complex conjugations due to symmetries being anti-unitary dropped out in the process of mapping the relation of phases into the relation of $C^n(G,\mathcal{A})$ cochains.

The remaining arguments that lead to the classification results are similarly modified. Similar to the steps described above, the localization region dependence drops out when the operator relations are converted into phase relations by applying them to states of the form $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$, and the complex conjugations that occur for anti-unitary symmetries drop out when these phase relations are converted into cochain relations. Thus, the obstruction of fractionalization by nontrivial $[\mathfrak{O}] \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ and the classification of symmetry fractionalization (when the obstruction vanishes) in terms of the cohomology class $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ is precisely the same for unitary and anti-unitary quasi-on-site symmetries as it was for unitary on-site symmetries.

We note that the projective representation analysis of Sec. IV E must include the complex conjugation of anti-unitary symmetries, so they are classified by $H^2_q(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$, which includes complex conjugation from anti-unitary symmetry action. In particular, the boundary operator includes the complex conjugation through the $\rho_g$ action, so the 2-cocycle condition on the projective phases becomes

$$e^{iq(\mathbf{g})\Phi(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})}e^{-i\Phi(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})}e^{i\Phi(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})}e^{-i\Phi(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} = 1, \tag{205}$$

and the projective phase is a 2-coboundary when

$$e^{i\Phi(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} = e^{iq(\mathbf{g})f(\mathbf{h})}e^{-if(\mathbf{gh})}e^{if(\mathbf{g})} \tag{206}$$

for some phase $e^{if(\mathbf{g})} \in C(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$. These modifications do not affect the symmetry fractionalization results.

When we specify a fusion basis decomposition of the topological state space of $n$ quasiparticles, we first specify an order in which to place the quasiparticles from left to right at the top of a fusion tree. Specifying an order in which one lists the quasiparticles is equivalent to specifying a line in the 2D manifold that passes through the quasiparticles in that order. The inclusion of rotational and spatial parity symmetry is complicated by the fact that these symmetry operations generally change the positions of the quasiparticles with respect to their ordering line. For spatial parity symmetries, we note that one can repeat the analysis above, with the modification that when phases in the analysis are mapped to $C^n(G,\mathcal{A})$ cochains, the action of $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ on the group elements $\mathcal{A}$ is modified to include topological charge conjugation whenever $p(\rho_{\mathbf{g}}) = 1$. This modification follows from the relation $S_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a)\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(b)} = K^{q(\mathbf{g})+p(\mathbf{g})}S_{ab}K^{q(\mathbf{g})+p(\mathbf{g})}$, which modifies the $\rho$ action in the cohomology structure, i.e. in the coboundary operator and the groups $H^n_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$, whenever $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ corresponds to a non-trivial parity symmetry, which changes the orientation of space.

Before concluding this section, we note that the above considerations provide a framework to classify the different possible types of symmetry fractionalization. However, not all elements of the $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ classes will be allowed in general. When $G$ corresponds to a spatial symmetry, there can be additional constraints that rule out certain types of fractionalization [119–123]. Even for on-site symmetries, as we will see, some of the fractionalization classes are anomalous and cannot be realized in a purely $2+1$ dimensional system.

### 1. *Time Reversal Symmetry Fractionalization and Local Kramers Degeneracy*

It is worth considering fractionalization in more detail for the case of time reversal symmetry, or, rather, a group element $\mathbf{T} \in G$ such that $\mathbf{T}^2 = \mathbf{0}$ and $q(\mathbf{T}) = 1$, i.e. it is an anti-unitary symmetry.

We first note that the state of the system can either form a linear representation with $R^2_{\mathbf{T}}|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle$ or a projective representation with $R^2_{\mathbf{T}}|\Psi\rangle = -|\Psi\rangle$. This follows from the $H^2_q(\mathbb{Z}_2^{\mathbf{T}},\mathrm{U}(1))$ classification of projective representations. In particular, the modified 2-cocycle condition of Eq. (205) is simply the condition $e^{i2\Phi_{\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}}} = 1$, and the modified 2-coboundary condition of Eq. (206) is $e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}}} = 1$. The projective representation $e^{i\Phi_{\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}}} = -1$ gives the usual degeneracy from Kramers theorem, where $|\Psi\rangle$ and $R_{\mathbf{T}}|\Psi\rangle$ are necessarily orthogonal and degenerate in energy for any state $|\Psi\rangle$ when $R_{\mathbf{T}}$ commutes with the Hamiltonian. Physically, this corresponds to the case where the system has half-integer angular momentum, i.e. an odd number of electrons in the system.

The symmetry action on the topological state space is specified by the action on fusion vertex states

$$\rho_{\mathbf{T}}|a,b;c,\mu\rangle = \sum_\nu [U_{\mathbf{T}}({}^{\mathbf{T}}a,\ {}^{\mathbf{T}}b;\ {}^{\mathbf{T}}c)]_{\mu\nu}|{}^{\mathbf{T}}a,\ {}^{\mathbf{T}}b;\ {}^{\mathbf{T}}c,\nu\rangle. \tag{207}$$

Since this is an anti-unitary symmetry, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}[\kappa_{\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}}(a,b;c)]_{\mu\nu} &= \sum_\lambda [U_{\mathbf{T}}({}^{\mathbf{T}}a,\ {}^{\mathbf{T}}b;\ {}^{\mathbf{T}}c)]^*_{\mu\lambda}[U_{\mathbf{T}}(a,b;c)]_{\lambda\nu} \\ &= \frac{\beta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})\beta_b(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})}{\beta_c(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})}\delta_{\mu\nu} \\ &= \frac{\eta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})\eta_b(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})}{\eta_c(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})}\delta_{\mu\nu}.\end{aligned} \tag{208}$$

The obstruction class is defined by

$$\Omega_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}) = \frac{1}{\beta_{{}^{\mathbf{T}}a}(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})\beta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})}. \tag{209}$$

The condition that the obstruction vanishes is equivalent to there being some $\omega_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})$ such that

$$\beta_{{}^{\mathbf{T}}a}(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})\beta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}) = \omega_{{}^{\mathbf{T}}a}(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})\omega_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}), \tag{210}$$

$$\omega_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})\omega_b(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}) = \omega_c(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}), \quad \text{if} \quad N^c_{ab} \neq 0. \tag{211}$$

We assume that the obstruction vanishes and that this anti-unitary symmetry acts in the quasi-on-site fashion with $R_{\mathbf{T}} = \prod_{k\in I} R^{(k)}_{\mathbf{T}} K$. From the quasi-on-site symmetry fractionalization analysis, we have

$$R_{\mathbf{T}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle = U^{(1)}_{\mathbf{T}} \ldots U^{(n)}_{\mathbf{T}} \rho_{\mathbf{T}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle. \tag{212}$$

The localized symmetry action operators $U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}$ have the projective consistency relation

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{a_j}(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle &= {}^{\mathbf{T}}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle \\ &= R_{\mathbf{T}}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}R_{\mathbf{T}}^{-1}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle \\ &= U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}\rho_{\mathbf{T}}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}\rho_{\mathbf{T}}^{-1}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle \quad (213)\end{aligned}$$

where the projective phases $\eta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})$ satisfy Eq. (203), which, in this case, is simply the condition that

$$\eta_{{}^{\mathbf{T}}a}(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}) = \eta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})^*. \quad (214)$$

When ${}^{\mathbf{T}}a = a$, this condition implies

$$\eta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}) = \pm 1, \quad (215)$$

and we interpret $\eta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})$ as the "local $\mathbf{T}^2$" value ascribed to the topological charge $a$. When $\eta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}) = -1$, there is also a local Kramers degeneracy [49] associated with the topological charge $a$. In other words, quasiparticles that carry topological charge $a$ also carry a local degenerate state space in physical systems that possess this symmetry. We also emphasize that $\theta_{{}^{\mathbf{T}}a} = \theta_a^*$, so, when ${}^{\mathbf{T}}a = a$, we also have $\theta_a = \pm 1$. However, we stress that it is not necessarily the case that $\theta_a$ equals $\eta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})$, as one might have naïvely expected from the usual understanding of Kramers degeneracy in terms of spin and fermionic parity.

When ${}^{\mathbf{T}}a = a$, ${}^{\mathbf{T}}b = b$, and ${}^{\mathbf{T}}c = c$, (and $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\eta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})\eta_b(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})}{\eta_c(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})}\delta_{\mu\nu} &= \frac{\beta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})\beta_b(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})}{\beta_c(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})}\delta_{\mu\nu} \\ &= \sum_\lambda [U_{\mathbf{T}}(a,b;c)]_{\mu\lambda}^*[U_{\mathbf{T}}(a,b;c)]_{\lambda\nu}. \quad (216)\end{aligned}$$

For $N_{ab}^c = 1$, the second line of this relation is simply equal to 1, which implies that

$$\eta_a(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})\eta_b(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}) = \eta_c(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}). \quad (217)$$

When ${}^{\mathbf{T}}c = c$ and $N_{a\,{}^{\mathbf{T}}a}^c = 1$, the ribbon property gives

$$R_c^{a\,{}^{\mathbf{T}}a}R_c^{{}^{\mathbf{T}}aa} = \theta_c, \quad (218)$$

and the transformation of the $R$-symbols under $\mathbf{T}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\mathbf{T}}\left(R_c^{a\,{}^{\mathbf{T}}a}\right) &= \left(R_c^{a\,{}^{\mathbf{T}}a}\right)^* = \frac{U_{\mathbf{T}}(a,{}^{\mathbf{T}}a;c)}{U_{\mathbf{T}}({}^{\mathbf{T}}a,a;c)}R_c^{{}^{\mathbf{T}}aa} \\ &= \kappa_{\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}}(a,{}^{\mathbf{T}}a;c)R_c^{{}^{\mathbf{T}}aa}. \quad (219)\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\eta_c(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}) = \theta_c = \pm 1 \quad (220)$$

when ${}^{\mathbf{T}}c = c$ and $N_{a\,{}^{\mathbf{T}}a}^c = 1$.

The properties given in Eqs. (217) and (220) are useful for determining the local $\mathbf{T}^2$ values of quasiparticle excitations in typical time-reversal invariant topological phases, see e.g. Refs. [89, 90, 118].

The analysis of fractionalization of time reversal symmetry presented in this section precisely matches that of Ref. [89]. In contrast with Ref. [49], our definition of local $\mathbf{T}^2$ for the $j$th quasiparticle of a state $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ (which carries topological charge $a_j$) is the corresponding eigenvalue $\eta_{a_j}(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})$ of the operator $R_{\mathbf{T}}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}R_{\mathbf{T}}^{-1}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}$ whose nontrivial action is localized in the region $\mathcal{R}_j$ containing the $j$th quasiparticle. In particular, this definition applies to the general case where there are an arbitrary number of regions/quasiparticles that transform nontrivially under $\mathbf{T}$ and where the entire system may transform projectively with $\mathbf{T}^2 = -1$. In considering the case where there are only two regions that transform nontrivially under $\mathbf{T}$ and where and the entire system transforms as $\mathbf{T}^2 = 1$, Ref. [49] interprets the operator $R_{\mathbf{T}}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(1)}$ as the "local $\mathbf{T}$" operator for region $\mathcal{R}_2$ and $R_{\mathbf{T}}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(2)}$ as the "local $\mathbf{T}$" operator for region $\mathcal{R}_1$. We avoid interpreting the operator $R_{\mathbf{T}}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}$ as a "local $\mathbf{T}$" operator (of some complementary region), as it is not a local operator and even its action on a quasiparticle state, which is given by

$$R_{\mathbf{T}}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle = \eta_{a_j}(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T})\prod_{k\neq j}U_{\mathbf{T}}^{(k)}\rho_{\mathbf{T}}|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle, \quad (221)$$

is generally not localized in one region (even when all the topological charges involved are $\mathbf{T}$-invariant).

## V. EXTRINSIC DEFECTS

Given the existence of a global symmetry $G$, we can introduce point-like defects that carry flux associated with the group elements $\mathbf{g} \in G$. In this section, we will describe a way to create such defects and some of their basic properties. We first give a prescription for creating $\mathbf{g}$-defects in some simple lattice model systems, and subsequently generalize this construction to an arbitrary system in a topological phase. At the end of this discussion, we will briefly discuss the case where there is no global symmetry, which still allows nontrivial point-like defects as long as $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ is nontrivial. In the following section (Sec. VI), we will build upon the physical motivation of this section and provide a detailed presentation of the algebraic theory of extrinsic defects, which is known in the mathematical literature as $G$-crossed braided tensor category theory [79, 82].

### A. Physical Realization of g-Defects

#### 1. Simple lattice model

We begin by considering a concrete model system, in which we can precisely describe the general idea we wish to abstract. In particular, we consider a system with a local Hilbert space defined on the sites of a square lattice, whose Hamiltonian $H_0$ has a local on-site unitary symmetry $G$. For simplicity, we restrict to the case where the interactions in $H_0$ are just nearest neighbor or plaquette interactions, so that the Hamiltonian

takes the form

$$H_0 = \sum_i h_i + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} h_{ij} + \sum_{[ijkl]} h_{ijkl}, \qquad (222)$$

where $h_i$ consists of local operators that act on site $i$, $h_{ij}$ consists of local operators that act on a pair of neighboring sites $i$ and $j$ connected by the link $\langle ij \rangle$, and $h_{ijkl}$ consists of local operators that act on a plaquette $[ijkl]$ defined by the sites $i$, $j$, $k$, and $l$.

A pair of defects carrying fluxes $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{g}^{-1}$, respectively, can be created and localized at a well-separated pair of plaquettes by modifying the Hamiltonian as follows. Imagine a line $C$ emanating from the center of one of the defect's corresponding plaquette, cutting across a set of links of the lattice, and terminating at the center of the other defect's plaquette, as shown in Fig. 5. We modify the original Hamiltonian by replacing each term in $H_0$ that straddles the line $C$ with the corresponding operator obtained from that term by acting with the symmetry locally on the sites only on one side of the line $C$.

In order to make this procedure well-defined, we first ascribe an orientation of the line $C$, indicated by an arrow pointing from the $\mathbf{g}^{-1}$-defect endpoint towards the $\mathbf{g}$-defect endpoint. (If $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{g}^{-1}$, it will not matter which orientation we choose.) This provides a well-defined notion of sites being immediately to the left or to the right of the line $C$. Specifically, the site $i$ is immediately to the left of $C$ and the site $j$ is immediately to the right of the line $C$, if $C$ crosses the link $\langle ij \rangle$ of the lattice connecting sites $i$ and $j$ with $i$ to the left and $j$ to the right, with respect to the orientation of the line $C$. We denote the set of all sites immediately to the left of $C$ as $C_l$ and the set of all sites immediately to the right as $C_r$. We can now define a term in the Hamiltonian to be straddling the line $C$ if it only acts nontrivially on sites in the union $C_l \cup C_r$ and it has nontrivial action on sites in both $C_l$ and $C_r$. [179] Finally, we conjugate such terms by the operator $R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(C_r)} = \prod_{j \in C_r} R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$, where $R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$ represents the local action of $\mathbf{g} \in G$ acting on site $j$. (Recall that the global on-site symmetry action can be written as the product of local operators $R_{\mathbf{g}} = \prod_{k \in I} R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(k)}$, where $I$ in this example is simply the set of all sites.)

Thus, the modified Hamiltonian is given by

$$H_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}} = H_0 + \sum_{\substack{\langle ij \rangle: \\ i \in C_l; j \in C_r}} [R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} h_{ij} R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)-1} - h_{ij}]$$
$$+ \sum_{\substack{[ijkl]: \\ i,l \in C_l; j,k \in C_r}} [R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)} R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(k)} h_{ijkl} R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)-1} R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(k)-1} - h_{ijkl}]. \qquad (223)$$

Here, we have assumed that the line $C$ is straight for simplicity. If $C$ was not a straight line, the last line in this Hamiltonian would include plaquette terms with one site on one side of $C$ and three sites on the other side of $C$, corresponding to the plaquettes where $C$ makes turns. This Hamiltonian $H_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$ defines a line defect associated with the line $C$. The two end points of $C$ are codimension-2 point defects which carry flux $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{g}^{-1}$, respectively. We refer to the line $C$ as a $\mathbf{g}$-defect branch line.




FIG. 5: (a) When the system is cut along a line $C$, quasiparticles cannot propagate across the cut. (b) The system can be reglued together along $C$ in a manner that conjugates bond/plaquette operators straddling the cut by a local $\mathbf{g}$-symmetry action on one side of the cut, as indicated by red dots. The result is a $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{g}^{-1}$ pair of defects at the end-points of the cut. (c) Such a construction effectively implements a $\mathbf{g}$-symmetry transformation on quasiparticles that propagate across the cut around the defects. For example, a quasiparticle $a$ will be transformed into $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a)$ when it encircles the $\mathbf{g}$-defect in a counterclockwise fashion. For symmetries that are not on-site, such as translational or rotational symmetries, $\mathbf{g}$-defects correspond to lattice dislocations or disclinations, respectively.

### 2. $\mathbf{g}$-conjugation of quasiparticles across defect line

When a quasiparticle is adiabatically transported around a $\mathbf{g}$-defect, it will be transformed by the symmetry action of the group element $\mathbf{g}$, as a consequence of crossing the $\mathbf{g}$-defect branch line. When the action $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ on topological charges is non-trivial, as a quasiparticle with topological charge $a$ encircles the point-like $\mathbf{g}$-defect at the end of the defect line $C$, the quasiparticle is transformed into one that carries topological charge $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a)$. Defects that permute the topological charge values of quasiparticles are sometimes referred to as "twist defects."

In order to understand this property, it is useful to first consider starting from the uniform system with Hamiltonian $H_0$, and introducing some quasiparticles using local potentials of the form $h_{a_j}^{(j)}$, as described in Sec. IV A, with the corresponding Hamiltonian $H_{a_1,\ldots,a_n;0}$. We now consider an operator $T_{a_k}(k,k')$ that moves the quasiparticle of charge $a_k$ from site $k$ on one side of the line $C$ (which at this point is simply an imaginary line drawn on the system) to the site $k'$ on the other side of $C$ in a manner that crosses the line $C$. Such an operator annihilates a quasiparticle of topological charge $a_k$ at site $k$, creates a quasiparticle of charge $a_k$ at site $k'$, and commutes with the Hamiltonian away from the sites $k$ and $k'$. (One may think of this as a "string operator.") Thus, if $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ were the ground states of the Hamiltonian $H_{a_1,\ldots,a_n;0}$ with $h_{a_j}^{(j)}$ localizing the quasiparticle at site $j$, then $|\Psi'_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle = T_{a_k}(k,k')|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\}}\rangle$ are the ground states of the Hamiltonian $H'_{a_1,\ldots,a_n;0}$ with $k$th term changed to $h_{a_k}^{(k')}$ localizing the quasiparticle at site $k'$ (perhaps up to some additional unitary transformations localized around the sites $k$ and $k'$). Consequently, it is possible to adiabatically change the

Hamiltonian between these configurations and, in doing so, adiabatically move the quasiparticle of charge $a_k$ from site $k$ to site $k'$.

We next imagine cutting all bonds of the system along the line $C$, as indicated in Fig. 5(a). The corresponding Hamiltonian is

$$H_{\text{cut}(C)} = H_0 - \sum_{\substack{\langle ij\rangle: \\ i\in C_l; j\in C_r}} h_{ij} - \sum_{\substack{[ijkl]: \\ i,l\in C_l; j,k\in C_r}} h_{ijkl}, \quad (224)$$

where we have again assumed $C$ is a straight line for simplicity. In this system, it is no longer possible to adiabatically move a quasiparticle across the line $C$ (without reintroducing the excised terms in the Hamiltonian), because there are no terms in the Hamiltonian that connect the system across $C$. If we introduce quasiparticles away from the line $C$ using local potentials to similarly produce a Hamiltonian $H_{a_1,\ldots,a_n;\text{cut}(C)}$, we would find that the operator $T_{a_k}(k,k')$ does not commute with the Hamiltonian $H_{\text{cut}(C)}$ in the vicinity of $C$ (nor in the vicinity of the sites $k$ and $k'$), hence it will create quasiparticles there. Consequently, this operator would now correspond to moving the quasiparticle from site $k$ to its nearer side the cut line $C$, pair creating quasiparticles of charge $a_k$ and $\bar{a}_k$ on the other side of the cut line $C$, and moving the charge $a_k$ of that pair to site $k'$, while leaving the charge $\bar{a}_k$ quasiparticle next to the cut line $C$ on the opposite side from the original quasiparticle. Such a process involves more than just adiabatically transporting the quasiparticle, since one must either introduce additional local potentials for the extra quasiparticles, or cost energy above the gap for creating the additional quasiparticles.

We now imagine reintroducing the bond/plaquette operators that connect the system across the cut line $C$ with a conjugation of these operators by the symmetry action of $\mathbf{g}$ acting locally only on the sites on one side of the cut, to obtain the Hamiltonian $H_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$. Then we introduce quasiparticles away from $C$ using local potentials to similarly produce a Hamiltonian $H_{a_1,\ldots,a_n;\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$. We similarly find that the operator $T_{a_k}(k,k')$ will, in general, not commute with the Hamiltonian $H_{\text{cut}(C)}$ in the vicinity of $C$ (nor in the vicinity of the sites $k$ and $k'$), and, therefore, must create extra quasiparticles there.

However, in this case, the line $C$ is not an untraversable cut line, and one can actually construct an operator that corresponds to adiabatically transporting a quasiparticle across $C$ (without creating extra quasiparticles). For this, we start from the operator $T_{a_k}(k,k')$, which can be written as a product of local operators, and modify it in the following way. The local terms in the product whose nontrivial action is entirely on the left side of $C$ are left unaltered, the local terms in the product whose nontrivial action is entirely on the right side of $C$ are conjugated by $R_{\mathbf{g}}$, and the local terms in the product that straddle $C$ are conjugated by $R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(C_r)}$. The resulting operator, which we denote $T_{a_k;\mathbf{g}}(k,k')$, annihilates a quasiparticle of topological charge $a_k$ at site $k$, creates a quasiparticle of charge ${}^{\mathbf{g}}a_k$ at site $k'$, and commutes with the Hamiltonian $H_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$ away from the sites $k$ and $k'$. (Note that if the unmodified operator $T_{a_k}(k,k')$ commutes with $H_0$ away from the sites $k$ and $k'$, then so does $R_{\mathbf{g}}T_{a_k}(k,k')R_{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}$.) Thus, if $|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\};\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}\rangle$ were the ground states of the Hamiltonian $H_{a_1,\ldots,a_n;\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$ with $h_{a_j}^{(j)}$ localizing the quasiparticle at site $j$, then $|\Psi'_{\{a';c',\mu'\};\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}\rangle = T_{a_k;\mathbf{g}}(k,k')|\Psi_{\{a;c,\mu\};\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}\rangle$ are the ground states of the Hamiltonian $H'_{a_1,\ldots,{}^{\mathbf{g}}a_k,\ldots,a_n;\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$ with the $k$th term changed to $h_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a_k}^{(k')}$ localizing a quasiparticle of charge ${}^{\mathbf{g}}a_k$ at site $k'$ (perhaps up to some additional unitary transformations localized around the sites $k$ and $k'$). Consequently, it is possible to adiabatically change the Hamiltonian between these configurations (without creating extra quasiparticles), and, in doing so, adiabatically move the quasiparticle from site $k$ to site $k'$, while also transforming its topological charge from $a_k$ to $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a_k)$ as it crosses the $\mathbf{g}$-defect branch line.

### 3. *General construction of* $\mathbf{g}$*-defects*

We can generalize the above discussion and prescription for creating defects to a general topologically ordered system with a local Hamiltonian $H_0$. Again, we first draw an oriented line $C$ in the system. We then define regions $C_l$ and $C_r$, which are "immediately" to the left and right of the line $C$, respectively. These regions should have width $w$ such that any term in the Hamiltonian that straddles the line $C$ has nontrivial action that is localized (perhaps up to exponentially damped tails) in the union $C_l \cup C_r$. Typically, this will require the width $w$ to be a few correlation lengths $\xi$. The precise details of how these regions, $C_l$ and $C_r$, terminate near the endpoints of the line $C$ is unimportant for establishing that there is a $\mathbf{g}$-defect (though it may play a role in determining which type of $\mathbf{g}$-defect is preferred, as we will explain below). We next identify the terms in $H_0$ whose nontrivial action is localized entirely within $C_l \cup C_r$, and denote the sum of these terms as $H_0(C)$. We define the operator $R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(C_r)} = \prod_{j:\mathcal{M}_j\subset C_r} R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$, where we decompose the space manifold $\mathcal{M} = \cup_{k\in I}\mathcal{M}_j$ into a collection of simply connected disjoint regions $\mathcal{M}_j$, none of which straddle the line $C$, i.e. $C \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{M}_j) = \emptyset$ for all $j$. Finally, we define the defect Hamiltonian

$$H_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}} = H_0 + [R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(C_r)} H_0(C) R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(C_r)-1} - H_0(C)]. \quad (225)$$

It should be clear that these constructions can also be generalized to describe the system with an arbitrary number $n$ of defects which carry group elements $\mathbf{g}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{g}_n$ whose product is identity $\prod_{j=1}^n \mathbf{g}_j = \mathbf{0}$.

### 4. *Point-like nature and confinement of* $\mathbf{g}$*-defects*

When $G$ is continuous or is physically obtained by spontaneously breaking a larger continuous symmetry, the $\mathbf{g}$-defects can be created gradually. This property is familiar in the case of superfluid vortices, where the phase of the order parameter rotates continuously by $2\pi$. For symmetries that are not on-site, such as translational or rotational symmetries, the defects correspond to lattice dislocations or disclinations. In all of these cases, the $\mathbf{g}$-defects are well-defined even though there

is no specific $\mathbf{g}$-branch line across which the $\mathbf{g}$-action takes place. In other words, the $\mathbf{g}$-defects are truly point-like objects.

In fact, from the perspective of the topological order and quantum numbers, the defect branch lines are completely invisible in general. There are no local measurements one can perform using topological properties and operations, such as quasiparticle braiding, that can identify the location of a defect branch line. Only the end-points of the branch lines, where the $\mathbf{g}$-defects are localized, are locally detectable by topological objects or operations. We stress that this does not necessarily mean that the branch lines are invisible to all forms of local measurements. Depending on the physical realization, the branch lines may or may not be a physically well-localized and measurable object. For example, in superconductor-semiconductor heterostructure-based realizations of Majorana and parafendleyon wires [9–11, 124–127], the defect branch lines are the segments of nanowires in the topological phase, and are clearly locally measurable and identifiable. On the other hand, for multi-layer systems with genons [6, 12], which are defects whose group action transfers quasiparticles from one layer to another, abstractly there may be no precise, well-defined location of the branch lines, whereas there may be in some experimental realizations [34].

The $\mathbf{g}$-defects defined above are *extrinsic defects* in the system, in the sense that they are imposed by deforming the uniform Hamiltonian to the defect Hamiltonian $H_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$. The locations of the $\mathbf{g}$-defects are classical parameters in $H_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$ and thus do not fluctuate quantum mechanically. However, if we allow the defects to become dynamical objects, whose positions do fluctuate quantum mechanically, then there is a question of whether they are confined or deconfined. If they are confined, then the energy cost to separating the dynamical $\mathbf{g}$-defects will grow with their separation. If they are deconfined, then the energy cost for separating the $\mathbf{g}$-defects will be finite and independent of their separation, up to exponentially small corrections. Given the Hamiltonian of the system, diagnosing whether the $\mathbf{g}$-defects correspond to confined or deconfined excitations may be a non-trivial task. We expect that one possible way to do this would be to obtain the ground state $|\Psi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}\rangle$ of $H_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$, and then to compute the average energy of this ground state with respect to the original Hamiltonian: $E^0_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}} = \langle\Psi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}|H_0|\Psi_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}\rangle$. The confinement/deconfinement of the defects would then correspond to whether $E^0_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$ diverges with the separation between the defects or is bounded by a finite value, respectively, in the limit of large separations.

If the $\mathbf{g}$-defects are deconfined, as described above, then they correspond to quasiparticle excitations of the phase $\mathcal{C}$. In such a case, the global $G$ symmetry effectively becomes an emergent local gauge invariance with gauge group $G$ at long wavelengths. In what follows, we focus on the case where the $\mathbf{g}$-defects correspond to *confined* objects, and in fact we will reserve the term $\mathbf{g}$-defect for this case. The case where $G$ is promoted to a local gauge invariance is described in Sec. VIII.

#### 5. *Twist defects without global symmetry*

It is important to note that even when the underlying physical system has no exact global symmetry of its microscopic Hamiltonian (i.e. $G$ is trivial), the existence of topological symmetry $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ of the emergent topological phase $\mathcal{C}$ implies the possibility of twist defects. In particular, one can potentially have point-like twist defects associated with non-trivial group elements in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. However without any global symmetries, creating such twist defects with a generic microscopic Hamiltonian is a more complicated issue, which we do not address here. [180]

As a simple example of the realization of twist defects directly from $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$, without a global symmetry, consider the twist defects associated with layer exchange in a double-layer topological phase [6]. These defects are well-defined even in the absence of an exact layer-exchange symmetry. Therefore the concept of a twist defect is not logically dependent on the global symmetry of the microscopic Hamiltonian. In what follows we focus on extrinsic point-like defects associated with elements of a global symmetry $G$. This is because (a) twist defects without global symmetries can still be considered in the same formalism by taking $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$, (b) we wish to develop a complete characterization of symmetry-enriched phases associated with a global symmetry $G$, and (c) we also wish to study the mechanism of gauging the global symmetry $G$, which requires us to start with a system where $G$ is an exact microscopic global symmetry.

### B. Topologically Distinct Types of $\mathbf{g}$-Defects

In the previous subsection, we provided an example of how to modify the Hamiltonian to realize $\mathbf{g}$-defects. However, it is not necessarily the case that there is a unique type of $\mathbf{g}$-defect that may be physically realized in a given topological phase. In principle, a topological phase may support multiple types of $\mathbf{g}$-defects that cannot be transformed into one another by the application of a local operator. In these cases, there would be topologically distinct types of $\mathbf{g}$-defects.

As a simple example, we may consider a Hamiltonian which makes it locally preferable for a quasiparticle with topological charge $b$ to be bound to the $\mathbf{g}$-defect. Under certain circumstances, this composite object might correspond to a topologically distinct type of $\mathbf{g}$-defect as compared to the original one. Indeed, as we will explain in the next subsection, two topologically distinct types of $\mathbf{g}$-defects can always be obtained from each other by fusion with a quasiparticle carrying an appropriate value of topological charge. This can be understood intuitively, since topologically distinct types of $\mathbf{g}$-defects can only differ by topological properties of the topological phase that can be point-like localized at the defect (endpoint of a $\mathbf{g}$-branch line). While there is no preference between topologically distinct $\mathbf{g}$-defects when considered in the topological context, it will generically be the case that there will be an energetic preference between distinct $\mathbf{g}$-defects, as they will have different energy costs for a given physical realization.




FIG. 6: A **g**-defect can possibly be altered into a topologically distinct type of **g**-defect by fusing it with a quasiparticle carrying nontrivial topological charge $b \in \mathcal{C}$. Whether the original $g$-defect and the $b$-**g** composite object are topologically distinct depends on whether there is some topological charge $e \in \mathcal{C}$, whose Wilson loop around the defects can distinguish them. Such a topological charge $e$ must be **g**-invariant, $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(e) = e$, otherwise its Wilson loop could not close upon itself after crossing the **g**-defect branch line.

If two **g**-defects are topologically distinct, then there must be a topological process that can distinguish them. This process corresponds to the Wilson loop operator $W_e$ associated with a $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$-invariant topological charge $e$ encircling the **g**-defect, as shown schematically in Fig. 6. Different possible eigenvalues of $W_e$ can be used to distinguish topologically distinct types of defects. In fact, we will later show that this statement can be made more precise. In particular, for a modular theory $\mathcal{C}$, we will show that one can write a linear combinations of such Wilson loop operators which acts as orthogonal projectors on the enclosed area onto each topologically distinct type of **g**-defect. (We will also show that the number of topologically distinct types of **g**-defects is equal to the number of $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ invariant topological charges in the original topological phase $\mathcal{C}$.)

In order to refer to topologically distinct types of **g**-defects, we must use a more refined labeling system than simply assigning them the group element **g**. We give each topologically distinct type of defect its own label $a$, which, in accord with prior terminology, we call topological charge. We write the set of topological charges corresponding to distinct types of **g**-defects as $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$. We will often use the notation $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ as a shorthand to indicate that $a \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$. We emphasize that this does not mean $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ is a composite object formed by a **g**-defect and a topological charge $a \in \mathcal{C}$ from the original topological phase. In this notation, the topological charge set labeled by the identity group element $\mathbf{0}$ is equal to the original set of topological charges of the topological phase, i.e. $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}} = \mathcal{C}$. We write the set of all topological charges as $\mathcal{C}_G$.

## VI. ALGEBRAIC THEORY OF DEFECTS

We now wish to develop a mathematical description of the topological properties, such as fusion and braiding, of **g**-defects in a topological phase $\mathcal{C}$ with global symmetry $G$, that generalizes (and includes) the UBTC theory used to describe (deconfined) quasiparticle excitations of the topological phase. The proper mathematical description of such defects is known as a $G$-crossed braided tensor category [79, 82]. In this section, we present the $G$-crossed theory, starting with $G$-graded fusion and then introducing $G$-crossed braiding. We derive the consistency conditions and a number of important properties for such theories. In Appendix D, we provide a concise presentation of $G$-crossed categories more properly using the abstract formalism of category theory.

### A. $G$-graded Fusion

It is clear that combining a **g**-defect with an **h**-defect should yield a **gh**-defect. Hence, the fusion of defects must respect the group multiplication structure of $G$, leading to the notion of $G$-graded fusion.

A fusion category $\mathcal{C}_G$ is $G$-graded if it can be written as

$$\mathcal{C}_G = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{g}\in G} \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}. \tag{226}$$

In particular, this means each topological charge $a \in \mathcal{C}_G$ is assigned a unique group element $\mathbf{g} \in G$ and corresponding charge subset $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ to which it belongs, such that fusion respects the group multiplication of $G$, i.e. if $a \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ and $b \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{h}}$, then $N_{ab}^c$ can only be nonzero if $c \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}$.

We recall the shorthand notation $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ used to indicate that $a \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$. With this, we can write the fusion rules [of Eq. (3)] as

$$a_{\mathbf{g}} \times b_{\mathbf{h}} = \sum_{c\in\mathcal{C}_G} N_{ab}^c c = \sum_{c\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}} N_{ab}^c c = \sum_c N_{ab}^c c_{\mathbf{gh}}. \tag{227}$$

All the properties and constraints of fusion categories from Sec. II A carry over directly to $G$-graded fusion categories. Clearly, the vacuum charge $0 \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$, where we write the identity element of the group $G$ as $\mathbf{0}$. It should be clear that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ is itself a fusion category, since it is closed under fusion. As such, we consider a $G$-graded category $\mathcal{C}_G$ to be a "$G$-extension" of its subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$.

The unique charge conjugate of a topological charge $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ is $\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$. Since $\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}$ is the unique topological charge with which $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ can fuse into vacuum, it follows that for any two distinct topological charges $a_{\mathbf{g}}, c_{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$, there must exist some nontrivial topological charges $b_{\mathbf{0}}, b'_{\mathbf{0}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ such that $c_{\mathbf{g}}$ is one of the fusion outcomes obtained from fusing $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ with $b_{\mathbf{0}}$ or fusing $b'_{\mathbf{0}}$ with $a_{\mathbf{g}}$, i.e. $N_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{0}}}^{c_{\mathbf{g}}} = N_{\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}c_{\mathbf{g}}}^{b_{\mathbf{0}}} \neq 0$ and $N_{b'_{\mathbf{0}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}^{c_{\mathbf{g}}} = N_{c_{\mathbf{g}}\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}}^{b'_{\mathbf{0}}} \neq 0$. Physically, this means that different types of **g**-defects in (a $G$-extension of) a topological phase described by $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ can indeed be obtained from each other by fusing quasiparticles, which carry topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$, with the **g**-defects. [181]

As before, the quantum dimensions (which are defined in the same way) obey the relation

$$d_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} d_{b_{\mathbf{h}}} = \sum_c N_{ab}^c d_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}. \tag{228}$$

We define the (total) quantum dimension of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ to be

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{g}} = \sqrt{\sum_{a\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}} d_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}^2}. \tag{229}$$

Using Eq. (228) and the fact that $N_{ab}^{c} = N_{c\bar{b}}^{a}$, we see, by picking some arbitrary $c \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$, that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}^2 &= \sum_{a\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}} d_{a_{\mathbf{0}}}^2 = \sum_{\substack{a,b\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}\\ x\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}}} d_{a_{\mathbf{0}}} d_{c_{\mathbf{g}}}^{-1} N_{ac_{\mathbf{g}}}^{x} d_{c_{\mathbf{g}}}^{-1} N_{x\overline{c_{\mathbf{g}}}}^{b} d_{b_{\mathbf{0}}} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{a,b\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}\\ x\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}}} d_{c_{\mathbf{g}}}^{-2} N_{x\overline{c_{\mathbf{g}}}}^{a} d_{a_{\mathbf{0}}} N_{x\overline{c_{\mathbf{g}}}}^{b} d_{b_{\mathbf{0}}} \\ &= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}} d_{c_{\mathbf{g}}}^{-2} \left(d_{x_{\mathbf{g}}} d_{c_{\mathbf{g}}}\right)^2 = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}} d_{x_{\mathbf{g}}}^2 = \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{g}}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{230}$$

for any $\mathbf{g} \in G$ with nonempty $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}} \neq \emptyset$. In particular, the quantum dimension of every nonempty $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ is

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{g}} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}} = |H|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_G}, \tag{231}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_G}$ is the total quantum dimension of $\mathcal{C}_G$ and we define the subgroup

$$H = \{\, \mathbf{h} \in G \mid \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{h}} \neq \emptyset \,\} \leq G. \tag{232}$$

That $H$ forms a subgroup of $G$ follows from the fact that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}, \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{h}} \neq \emptyset$ implies that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}} \neq \emptyset$, together with the existence of a vacuum charge and charge conjugates.

In this paper, we will focus our attention to faithfully $G$-graded categories, i.e. those with $H = G$, so that there is no $\mathbf{g} \in G$ with $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}} = \emptyset$. In other words, we study the full defect theory associated with all group elements $\mathbf{g} \in G$. We note that one could instead choose to study the defect theory associated with a subgroup $H \leq G$. In this case, one can leave $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ for $\mathbf{g} \notin H$ empty and then study the resulting non-faithfully $G$-graded category. Such a non-faithfully $G$-graded category would just be a faithfully $H$-graded category, with the empty sets $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ for $\mathbf{g} \notin H$ included formally. This is only nontrivial once we also include the symmetry action of such $\mathbf{g} \notin H$.

### B. $G$-Crossed Braiding

We can consider a continuous family of Hamiltonians $H(\lambda)$ of the physical system containing defects (possibly including quasiparticles, which we consider to be $\mathbf{0}$-defects), where the locations of the defects and their corresponding branch lines are changed adiabatically as a function of the parameter $\lambda$. This allows us to implement physical operations that exchange the positions of defects.

With this in mind, we wish to define a notion of braiding of defects, called "$G$-crossed braiding," that includes group action and which is compatible with a $G$-graded fusion category $\mathcal{C}_G$. We denote such a $G$-crossed braided tensor category as $\mathcal{C}_G^{\times}$. This requires some modification of the usual definition of braiding. In fact, when $G$ is a non-Abelian group, fusion in a $G$-graded fusion category is not commutative, so the usual notion of braiding cannot even be applied. In particular, there must be a group action when the positions of objects (carrying nontrivial group elements) are exchanged. (Of course, the usual definition of braiding still applies within the subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$, which is a BTC.)




FIG. 7: (a) Each symmetry defect is labeled by a topological charge and has a corresponding defect branch line emanating from it characterized by a symmetry group element. Here we show a $\mathbf{g}$-defect with charge $a$ and an $\mathbf{h}$-defect with charge $b$, and their corresponding branch lines in a 2D system. (b) As a $\mathbf{g}$-defect is braided with an $\mathbf{h}$-defect in the counterclockwise sense, one can imagine deforming the corresponding branch lines, so that no objects cross them. (c) In order to return to the original configuration of branch lines, one must pass the $\mathbf{g}$ branch line across the $\mathbf{h}$-defect and its branch line. As the $\mathbf{h}$-defect of topological charge $b$ passes through the $\mathbf{g}$ branch line, the topological charge $b$ is transformed to $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(b)$ and the $\mathbf{h}$ branch line is transformed into a ${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{ghg}^{-1}$ branch line. This corresponds to the $G$-crossed braiding operator $R^{\mathbf{g}b_{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}$, as defined in Eq. (233).

As the mathematical formalism is developed, it will become clear that one can also physically implement braiding transformations for non-Abelian defects by using topological charge measurements and/or tunable interactions, following the "measurement-only" methods of Refs. [128–130]. As these methods remove the need to physically move the defects, they may provide a more preferable physical implementation of braiding transformations, depending on the details of the physical system.

When the objects carry non-trivial group elements, they are considered symmetry defects, which one can think of as having a branch cut line emanating from the otherwise point-like object. These branch cuts are oriented and are labeled by the group element of the object at which they terminate, so that taking an object through a $\mathbf{g}$-branch in the counterclockwise sense around the branch point at the corresponding $\mathbf{g}$-defect gives $\mathbf{g}$-action on that object, as shown in Fig. 7. In order to describe this using diagrammatics, we choose the convention where the branch lines, which form worldsheets that end on the worldlines of the defects, go into the page, and then we leave the branch line worldsheets implicit in the diagrammatics. This does not impose any restriction on how the defect branch lines must be physically configured in the actual system. Rather, it is merely a bookkeeping tool that allows us to consistently keep track of the effects of the branch lines in the diagrammatics, while only drawing the worldlines of the defects and not the branch line worldsheets. With this convention, a $\mathbf{g}$-defect worldline applies group action on objects when it crosses over their worldlines. In particular, we define

$G$-crossed braiding by

$R^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}} =$ 

$$= \sum_{c,\mu,\nu} \sqrt{\frac{d_c}{d_a d_b}} \left[R^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}\right]_{\mu\nu}$$  (233)

where the $R$-symbols for a $G$-crossed theory are the maps $R^{ab}_c : V^{b_{\mathbf{h}}\ {}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}} \to V^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}$ that result from exchanging (in a counterclockwise manner) two objects of charges $b_{\mathbf{h}}$ and ${}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}}a_{\mathbf{g}}$, respectively, which are in the charge $c_{\mathbf{gh}}$ fusion channel. We recall that

$$ {}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}} = \rho_{\mathbf{g}}(b_{\mathbf{h}}) \quad (234)$$

$$ \bar{\mathbf{g}} = \mathbf{g}^{-1} \quad (235)$$

$$ {}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}^{-1} \quad (236)$$

in the shorthand notation introduced in Sec. III B for the symmetry group action on topological charges. [182]

The symmetry action $[\rho] : G \to \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}})$ on the original theory must now be self-consistently extended to an action of the symmetry group

$$[\rho] : G \to \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}^{\times}_G) \quad (237)$$

that is incorporated within the structure of the extended theory. Notice, for example, that compatibility with the $G$-graded fusion rules required that ${}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{ghg}^{-1}}$, i.e.

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}} : \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{h}} \to \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{ghg}^{-1}}. \quad (238)$$

More generally, compatibility with the fusion algebra requires

$$N^{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}} = N^{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}. \quad (239)$$

From this, together with the properties of charge conjugates, it follows that $N^0_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}} = N^0_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}}} = \delta_{b_{\mathbf{h}}\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}}$, and hence any topological charge in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ will be invariant under the action of the corresponding $\mathbf{g}$, i.e.

$$ {}^{\mathbf{g}}a_{\mathbf{g}} = {}^{\mathbf{g}^n}a_{\mathbf{g}} = a_{\mathbf{g}}, \quad (240)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

For some theories (this may occur also in FTCs or BTCs), it may be possible for a topological charge $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ to remain unchanged after fusion/splitting with another nontrivial topological charge $b_{\mathbf{0}}$. In particular, this occurs when $N^{a_{\mathbf{g}}}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{0}}} = N^{a_{\mathbf{g}}}_{b_{\mathbf{0}}a_{\mathbf{g}}} \neq 0$. In this case, $b_{\mathbf{0}}$ quasiparticles can be absorbed or emitted at the $a_{\mathbf{g}}$-defect without changing the localized topological charge or localization energy of the defect. As such, we say that defects (or quasiparticles) that carry charge $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ localize a "$b_{\mathbf{0}}$ zero mode." It is clear from

$$N^{a_{\mathbf{g}}}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{0}}} = N^{a_{\mathbf{g}}}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}\overline{b_{\mathbf{0}}}} = N^{a_{\mathbf{g}}}_{b_{\mathbf{0}}a_{\mathbf{g}}} = N^{b_{\mathbf{0}}}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}} = N^{\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}}_{\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}b_{\mathbf{0}}} = N^{a_{\mathbf{g}}}_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{0}}a_{\mathbf{g}}} \quad (241)$$

that if $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ localizes a $b_{\mathbf{0}}$ zero mode, then: (1) $\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}$ also localizes a $b_{\mathbf{0}}$ zero mode, (2) $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ and $\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}$ localize $\overline{b_{\mathbf{0}}}$ zero modes and also zero modes associated with the entire $\mathbf{g}$-orbit of charges ${}^{\mathbf{g}^n}b_{\mathbf{0}}$, and (3) $b_{\mathbf{0}}$ is one of the fusion channels of $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ with its conjugate $\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}$, as is $\overline{b_{\mathbf{0}}}$ and ${}^{\mathbf{g}^n}b_{\mathbf{0}}$.

The $G$-crossed $R$-symbols can equivalently be written in terms of the relation



$$= \sum_{\nu} \left[R^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}\right]_{\mu\nu}$$  . (242)

Similarly, the clockwise $G$-crossed braiding exchange operator is

$\left(R^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}\right)^{-1} =$ 

$$= \sum_{c,\mu,\nu} \sqrt{\frac{d_c}{d_a d_b}} \left[\left(R^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\mu\nu}$$  (243)

In order for $G$-crossed braiding to be compatible with fusion, we again wish to have the ability to slide lines over or under fusion vertices. However, we may no longer assume that such operations are completely trivial, since one must at least account for the group action on a vertex. The appropriate relations are given by the unitary transformations



$$= \sum_{\nu} \left[U_{\mathbf{k}}\left(a,b;c\right)\right]_{\mu\nu}$$  (244)



$$= \eta_x\left(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}\right)$$  . (245)

We have used the same notation $\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}\left(a,b;c\right)\right]_{\mu\mu'}$ and $\eta_x\left(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}\right)$ that we previously introduced for the global symmetry action on the topological degrees of freedom in Sec. III B and the fractionalized (projective) local symmetry action in Sec. IV B, because, as we will see, these are precisely the same quantities extended to the entire $G$-crossed theory. Intuitively, it should be clear why this is the case, since a $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ line in the $G$-crossed braided diagrammatics has an implicit $\mathbf{g}$ branch sheet behind it that applies a $\mathbf{g}$ action to anything that passes through it, i.e. anything that the $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ line passes over. Hence, sliding a $x_{\mathbf{k}}$ line over a vertex, as in Eq. (244), passes the vertex through the $\mathbf{k}$ branch sheet, and should result in the $\mathbf{k}$ action on that vertex. Similarly, passing a $|a_{\mathbf{g}}, b_{\mathbf{h}}; c_{\mathbf{gh}}, \mu\rangle$ vertex over a $x_{\mathbf{k}}$ line, as in Eq. (245), should capture the local projective relation of equating $\mathbf{gh}$ action on charge $x$ with successively

applied $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{h}$ actions on charge $x$, as the vertex indicates where the $\mathbf{gh}$ branch sheet splits into a $\mathbf{g}$ branch sheet and an $\mathbf{h}$ branch sheet. The validity of this claim will be established through the following consistency arguments and conditions. The quantity $[U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,b;c)]_{\mu\mu'}$ here corresponds to a specific choice of $\rho \in [\rho]$, and we will see that the relation between choices within a symmetry action equivalence class (related by natural isomorphisms) will take the form of a gauge transformation in this theory.

We begin by arguing that the factors in these expressions must have the given dependence on the various topological and group quantities. In particular, in Eq. (244), we see that the nontrivial interaction is between the $\mathbf{k}$-branch line and the vertex, hence there may be dependence on $\mathbf{k}$, but not the specific $x$ within $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{k}}$, and the transformation on the fusion state space may be nontrivial, so it may depend on all the vertex labels. For Eq. (245), we see that the nontrivial interaction is between the $\mathbf{g}$, $\mathbf{h}$, and $\mathbf{gh}$ branch lines and the topological charge $x$, so this expression should not depend on the specific topological charge values $a$, $b$, or $c$, (just their corresponding group elements), nor should it have any effect within the fusion state space (on the vertex).

Sliding a line over a vertex, as in Eq. (244) is a unitary transformation between $V_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}c}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}a\,\bar{\mathbf{k}}b}$ and $V_c^{ab}$, as specified by the unitary operators $U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,b;c)$. This requires the dimensionality of the fusion spaces to be preserved under the corresponding symmetry action, giving

$$N_{\mathbf{k}a_{\mathbf{g}}\,\mathbf{k}b_{\mathbf{h}}}^{\mathbf{k}c_{\mathbf{gh}}} = N_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}^{c_{\mathbf{gh}}} \tag{246}$$

for any $\mathbf{k}$ acting on a vertex. It follows that the quantum dimensions are also invariant

$$d_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} = d_{\mathbf{k}a_{\mathbf{g}}}. \tag{247}$$

Clearly, if the sliding line has vacuum charge $x_{\mathbf{k}} = 0$, the sliding transformations should be trivial, so

$$[U_{\mathbf{0}}(a,b;c)]_{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu} \tag{248}$$

$$\eta_0(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = 1. \tag{249}$$

We require that the sliding rules are compatible with the property that vacuum lines can be freely added or removed from a diagram, i.e. sliding over/under a vertex $|a,b;c\rangle$ with $a = 0$ or $b = 0$ should be trivial, since it is equivalent to simply sliding over a line. This imposes the conditions

$$U_{\mathbf{k}}(0,0;0) = U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,0;a) = U_{\mathbf{k}}(0,b;b) = 1 \tag{250}$$

$$\eta_x(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) = \eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0}) = \eta_x(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{h}) = 1. \tag{251}$$

Combining Eqs. (244) and (245) with trivial braidings, such as




, (252)

we see that sliding lines over or under vertices with the opposite braiding are given by




(253)




. (254)

Compatibility with the inner product Eq. (7) gives the corresponding relations for sliding over and under fusion (rather than splitting) vertices




(255)




(256)




(257)




(258)

We require that the sliding moves are consistent with each other by requiring that any two sequences of sliding moves that start in the same configuration and end in the same configuration are equivalent. This can be achieved by equating the two different sequences of sliding moving shown in Fig. 8, which results in the consistency conditions between the $U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,b;c)$ and the $\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ factors given by




FIG. 8: The $G$-crossed symmetry action consistency equation provides consistency between the sliding moves, which implement the $U$ and $\eta$ transformations associated with the global and fractionalized (local projective) symmetry action. Eq. (260) is obtained by imposing the condition that the above diagram commutes.

$$\eta_b\left(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}\right)\eta_a\left(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}\right)\sum_{\lambda}\left[U_{\mathbf{l}}\left({}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}a,\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}b;\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}c\right)\right]_{\mu\lambda}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}\left(a,b;c\right)\right]_{\lambda\nu}=\left[U_{\mathbf{kl}}\left(a,b;c\right)\right]_{\mu\nu}\eta_c\left(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}\right). \tag{259}$$

If we define $\kappa_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}=\rho_{\mathbf{kl}}\rho_{\mathbf{l}}^{-1}\rho_{\mathbf{k}}^{-1}$ and $\kappa_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}|a_{\mathbf{g}},b_{\mathbf{h}};c_{\mathbf{gh}},\mu\rangle=\sum_{\nu}\left[\kappa_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}(a,b;c)\right]_{\mu\nu}|a_{\mathbf{g}},b_{\mathbf{h}};c_{\mathbf{gh}},\nu\rangle$, we see that this condition can be rewritten as the symmetry action consistency equation

$$\left[\kappa_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}(a,b;c)\right]_{\mu\nu}=\sum_{\alpha,\beta}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}\left(a,b;c\right)^{-1}\right]_{\mu\alpha}\left[U_{\mathbf{l}}\left({}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}a,\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}b;\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}c\right)^{-1}\right]_{\alpha\beta}\left[U_{\mathbf{kl}}\left(a,b;c\right)\right]_{\beta\nu}=\frac{\eta_a\left(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}\right)\eta_b\left(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}\right)}{\eta_c\left(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}\right)}\delta_{\mu\nu}. \tag{260}$$

Using this condition to decompose $U_{\mathbf{klm}}\left(a,b;c\right)$ in the two equivalent ways related by associativity, one obtains the following consistency condition on the $\kappa_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}$

$$\kappa_{\mathbf{l},\mathbf{m}}({}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}a,\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}b;\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}c)\kappa_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{lm}}(a,b;c)=\kappa_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}(a,b;c)\kappa_{\mathbf{kl},\mathbf{m}}(a,b;c). \tag{261}$$

Thus, we see that sliding an $x_{\mathbf{k}}$ line over a vertex or operator can indeed be thought of as implementing the $G$-crossed extension of the symmetry action $\rho_{\mathbf{k}}$, with $U_{\mathbf{k}}\left(a,b;c\right)$ playing the same role as in Sec. III B. Similarly, sliding an $x_{\mathbf{k}}$ line under a $|a_{\mathbf{g}},b_{\mathbf{h}};c_{\mathbf{gh}},\mu\rangle$ vertex can be thought of as implementing the $G$-crossed extension of the projective phases $\eta_x\left(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}\right)$ relating the local symmetry action of $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{h}$ to $\mathbf{gh}$.

We continue expounding the relation of the sliding moves to the symmetry action by next requiring consistency between the sliding moves and the $F$-moves. Sliding a line over a fusion tree before or after application of an $F$-move gives



$$=\sum_{\alpha',\beta',f,\mu',\nu'}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}\left({}^{\mathbf{k}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}b;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}e\right)\right]_{\alpha\alpha'}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}\left({}^{\mathbf{k}}e,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}c;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}d\right)\right]_{\beta\beta'}\left[F_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}d}^{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}b\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}c}\right]_{({}^{\mathbf{k}}e,\alpha',\beta')({}^{\mathbf{k}}f,\mu',\nu')}$$



$$=\sum_{f,\mu,\nu,\mu',\nu'}\left[F_{d}^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}\left({}^{\mathbf{k}}b,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}c;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}f\right)\right]_{\mu\mu'}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}\left({}^{\mathbf{k}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}f;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}d\right)\right]_{\nu\nu'}$$



, (262)

which yields the consistency condition

$$\sum_{\alpha',\beta',\mu'\nu'}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}({}^{\mathbf{k}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}b;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}e)\right]_{\alpha\alpha'}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}({}^{\mathbf{k}}e,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}c;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}d)\right]_{\beta\beta'}\left[F_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}d}^{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}b\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}c}\right]_{({}^{\mathbf{k}}e,\alpha',\beta')({}^{\mathbf{k}}f,\mu',\nu')}$$
$$\times\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}({}^{\mathbf{k}}b,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}c;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}f)^{-1}\right]_{\mu'\mu}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}({}^{\mathbf{k}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}f;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}d)^{-1}\right]_{\nu'\nu}=\left[F_{d}^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)} \tag{263}$$

This condition is the statement of invariance of the $F$-symbols (of the $G$-crossed theory) under the symmetry action.

Similarly, sliding a line under a fusion tree before or after application of an $F$-move gives




$$= \eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\,\eta_x(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k}) \sum_{f,\mu,\nu} \left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)}$$




$$= \sum_{f,\mu,\nu} \left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)} \eta_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}x}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\,\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})$$




, (264)

which yields the consistency condition

$$\eta_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}x}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\,\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk}) = \eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\,\eta_x(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})\,. \tag{265}$$

This is the statement of fractionalization being consistent in the $G$-crossed theory. Recall from Sec. IV that this relation translates into the condition that the obstruction to fractionalization vanishes, so here we see a direct way in which a nontrivial obstruction would make it impossible to consistently extend the original theory $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ to a $G$-crossed theory $\mathcal{C}_G^{\times}$.

Sliding a line under a $G$-crossed braiding operation gives the $G$-crossed Yang-Baxter equation




$$= \frac{\eta_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a}(\mathbf{kh\bar{k}},\mathbf{k})}{\eta_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{h})}$$




. (266)

Here, we slid the $a$ line under the $R^{bx}$ braiding operator and obtained the $\eta_a$ factors by expanding the $R^{bx}$ braiding operator in terms of fusion and splitting vertices.

Alternatively, we can obtain a similar relation by sliding the $x$ line over the $R^{ab}$ braiding operator, but this case there will be symmetry action applied to the braiding operation, so we must explicitly expand it, giving




$$= \sum_{c,\mu,\nu} \sqrt{\frac{d_c}{d_a d_b}} \left[R_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\nu}$$




$$= \sum_{c,\mu,\nu,\mu',\nu'} \sqrt{\frac{d_c}{d_a d_b}} \left[U_{\mathbf{k}}({}^{\mathbf{k}}b,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}\bar{\mathbf{h}}}a;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}c)^{-1}\right]_{\mu'\mu} \left[R_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\nu} \left[U_{\mathbf{k}}({}^{\mathbf{k}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}b;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}c)\right]_{\nu\nu'}$$




. (267)

Comparing this relation with the G-crossed Yang-Baxter equation by expanding the $R^{ab}$ braiding operator in Eq. (266), we obtain the consistency condition between braiding and sliding moves

$$\frac{\eta_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a}(\mathbf{kh\bar{k}},\mathbf{k})}{\eta_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{h})} \sum_{\mu',\nu'} \left[U_{\mathbf{k}}({}^{\mathbf{k}}b,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}\bar{\mathbf{h}}}a;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}c)\right]_{\mu\mu'} \left[R^{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}b}_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}c}\right]_{\mu'\nu'} \left[U_{\mathbf{k}}({}^{\mathbf{k}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}b;\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}c)^{-1}\right]_{\nu'\nu} = \left[R_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\nu} \tag{268}$$



FIG. 9: The $G$-crossed Heptagon equations provide consistency conditions between $G$-crossed braiding, fusion, and sliding moves. Eqs. (272) and (273) are obtained by imposing the conditions that the above diagrams commute.

This is the $G$-crossed generalization of the statement that the $R$-symbols are invariant under the symmetry action. Notice the presence of the $\eta$ factors, as compared to Eq. (88), to which this expression reduces when $a, b, c \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$.

We reemphasize the fact that imposing consistency on the sliding moves has resulted in consistency conditions that precisely replicate the symmetry action constraints and properties described in Secs. III and IV, and extend them from acting on the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ theory to its $G$-crossed extensions. This justifies our use of the same symbols $[U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,b;c)]_{\mu\mu'}$ and $\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ for the transformations associated with the sliding moves.

We note, for future use, that sliding a line under and another line over a vertex gives the relation

$$\eta_{^{\mathbf{k}}x}\left({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g},\ {}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{h}\right) = \frac{\eta_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}x}\left(\bar{\mathbf{k}},\mathbf{k}\mathbf{h}\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)}{\eta_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}x}\left(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)}\frac{\eta_x\left(\mathbf{g}\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)}{\eta_x\left(\bar{\mathbf{k}},\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)}\frac{\eta_x\left(\bar{\mathbf{k}},\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)}{\eta_x\left(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)}\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \tag{269}$$

for how $\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ transforms under $\mathbf{k}$-action. This can be obtained from



$$= \eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\left[U_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}({}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}a,\ {}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}b;\ {}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}c)^{-1}\right]_{\mu\nu}\frac{\eta_x\left(\mathbf{g}\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)}{\eta_x\left(\bar{\mathbf{k}},\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}\mathbf{h}\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)} \tag{270}$$



$$= \frac{\eta_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}x}\left(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)}{\eta_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}x}\left(\bar{\mathbf{k}},\mathbf{k}\mathbf{h}\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)}\frac{\eta_x\left(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)}{\eta_x\left(\bar{\mathbf{k}},\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}\bar{\mathbf{k}}\right)}\left[U_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}({}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}a,\ {}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}b;\ {}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}c)^{-1}\right]_{\mu\nu}\eta_{^{\mathbf{k}}x}\left({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g},\ {}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{h}\right) \tag{271}$$

where the two lines in this expression correspond to the two orders in which one can slide the $x$ and $y$ lines.

Finally, we require consistency between $G$-crossed braiding and fusion, as well as the sliding moves, so that any two sequences of moves that start from the same configuration and end in the same configuration must be equivalent. This is achieved by imposing the following $G$-crossed Heptagon equations, which are analogous to the Hexagon equations of BTCs, a diagrammatic representation of which is shown in Fig. 9. The Heptagon equation for counterclockwise braiding exchanges is

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\lambda,\gamma}\left[R_e^{ac}\right]_{\alpha\lambda}\left[F_d^{a\,c\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}b}\right]_{(e,\lambda,\beta)(g,\gamma,\nu)}\left[R_g^{bc}\right]_{\gamma\mu}\\ &\quad=\sum_{f,\sigma,\delta,\eta,\psi}\left[F_d^{c\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}a\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}b}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)\left({}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}f,\delta,\sigma\right)}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,b;f)\right]_{\delta\eta}\left[R_d^{fc}\right]_{\sigma\psi}\left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(f,\eta,\psi)(g,\mu,\nu)},\end{aligned} \tag{272}$$

in which we left the group labels for $a_{\mathbf{g}}$, $b_{\mathbf{h}}$, $c_{\mathbf{k}}$, $d_{\mathbf{ghk}}$, $e_{\mathbf{gk}}$, $f_{\mathbf{gh}}$, and $g_{\mathbf{hk}}$ implicit. Similarly, the Heptagon equation for clockwise

braiding exchanges is

$$\sum_{\lambda,\gamma}\left[\left(R_e^{ca}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\alpha\lambda}\left[F_d^{a\,\bar{\mathbf{g}}cb}\right]_{(e,\lambda,\beta)(g,\gamma,\nu)}\left[\left(R_g^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}cb}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\gamma\mu}$$
$$=\sum_{f,\sigma,\delta,\psi}\left[F_d^{cab}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\delta,\sigma)}\eta_c\left(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}\right)\left[\left(R_d^{cf}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\sigma\psi}\left[F_d^{ab\,\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}}c}\right]_{(f,\delta,\psi)(g,\mu,\nu)}, \tag{273}$$

in which we left the group labels for $a_{\mathbf{g}}$, $b_{\mathbf{h}}$, $c_{\mathbf{k}}$, $d_{\mathbf{kgh}}$, $e_{\mathbf{kg}}$, $f_{\mathbf{gh}}$, and $g_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}\mathbf{kgh}}$ implicit (the differences being due to how the group action enters braiding in the counterclockwise vs. clockwise braiding operators).

Given the trivial associativity of the vacuum charge 0 ($F_d^{abc}=\mathbb{1}$ when $a$, $b$, or $c=0$), the Heptagon equations imply that braiding with the vacuum is trivial, i.e. $R_a^{a0}=R_a^{0a}=\left(R_a^{a0}\right)^{-1}=\left(R_a^{0a}\right)^{-1}=1$ for any value of $a\in\mathcal{C}_G$.

If we further require unitarity of the theory, then $\left(R^{ab}\right)^{-1}=\left(R^{ab}\right)^{\dagger}$, which can be expressed in terms of $R$-symbols as $\left[\left(R_c^{ab}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\mu\nu}=\left[R_c^{ab}\right]^{*}_{\nu\mu}$.

### C. Gauge Transformations

The basic data given by $N_{ab}^c$, $F_d^{abc}$, $R_c^{ab}$, $\rho_{\mathbf{k}}$ [which includes $U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,b;c)$], and $\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ that satisfy the consistency conditions described in the previous subsections defines a $G$-crossed braided tensor category, which we can consider to be a generalized anyon and defect model. There is, however, some redundancy between different collections of basic data due to gauge freedom, similar to the case of BTCs. Thus, we again wish to characterize theories as equivalent when they are related by gauge transformations. For $G$-crossed BTCs, it is useful to separate gauge transformations into two classes.

The first type of gauge transformation is familiar from BTCs. In particular, these gauge transformations derive from the redundancy of redefining the fusion/splitting vertex basis states

$$\widetilde{|a,b;c,\mu\rangle}=\sum_{\mu'}\left[\Gamma_c^{ab}\right]_{\mu\mu'}|a,b;c,\mu'\rangle \tag{274}$$

where $\Gamma_c^{ab}$ is a unitary transformation. Such gauge transformations modify the $F$-symbols in precisely the same way we have previously seen in Eq. (51). The transformation of $G$-crossed $R$-symbols is slightly modified from that of BTCs to accommodate the symmetry actions that are incorporated in braiding, and is given by

$$\left[\widetilde{R}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}\right]_{\mu\nu}=\sum_{\mu',\nu'}\left[\Gamma_c^{b\,\bar{\mathbf{h}}a}\right]_{\mu\mu'}\left[R_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}\right]_{\mu'\nu'}\left[\left(\Gamma_c^{ab}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\nu'\nu}. \tag{275}$$

The symmetry action transformation become

$$\left[\widetilde{U}_{\mathbf{k}}\left(a,b;c\right)\right]_{\mu\nu}= \tag{276}$$
$$\sum_{\mu',\nu'}\left[\Gamma^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}a\,\bar{\mathbf{k}}b}_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}c}\right]_{\mu\mu'}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}\left(a,b;c\right)\right]_{\mu'\nu'}\left[\left(\Gamma_c^{ab}\right)^{-1}\right]_{\nu'\nu}.$$

These gauge transformations leave $\widetilde{\eta}_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})=\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ unchanged, and consequently $\widetilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}=\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ is also unchanged.

The second type of gauge transformation is derived from the equivalence of symmetry actions by natural isomorphisms, i.e. $\check{\rho}_{\mathbf{g}}=\Upsilon_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$, which we discussed in Secs. III and IV. In particular, these gauge transformations enact the following modifications of the basic data

$$\left[\check{F}_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)}=\left[F_d^{abc}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)}, \tag{277}$$
$$\left[\check{R}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}\right]_{\mu\nu}=\gamma_a(\mathbf{h})\left[R_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}\right]_{\mu\nu}, \tag{278}$$
$$\left[\check{U}_{\mathbf{k}}\left(a,b;c\right)\right]_{\mu\nu}=\frac{\gamma_a(\mathbf{k})\gamma_b(\mathbf{k})}{\gamma_c(\mathbf{k})}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}\left(a,b;c\right)\right]_{\mu\nu}, \tag{279}$$
$$\check{\eta}_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})=\frac{\gamma_x(\mathbf{gh})}{\gamma_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}x}(\mathbf{h})\gamma_x(\mathbf{g})}\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}), \tag{280}$$

which leave the $F$-symbols unchanged, since the symmetry action is incorporated through braiding. [The symmetry action on topological charge labels is unchanged $\check{\rho}_{\mathbf{g}}(a)=\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a)$.] Thus, theories with different choices of $\rho\in[\rho]$ are equivalent under this type of gauge transformation.

We refer to these two types of gauge transformations as vertex basis gauge transformations and symmetry action gauge transformations, respectively. It is straightforward to check that all the consistency conditions are left invariant under both types of gauge transformations.

As before, one must be careful not to use the gauge freedom associated with the canonical gauge choices associated with making fusion, braiding, and sliding with the vacuum trivial, and respecting the canonical isomorphisms that allow one to freely add and remove vacuum lines. In particular, one must fix $\Gamma_a^{a0}=\Gamma_b^{0b}=\Gamma_0^{00}$, as in the case of BTCs, and also fix $\gamma_0(\mathbf{h})=\gamma_a(\mathbf{0})=1$.

### D. $G$-Crossed Invariants, Twists, and $S$-Matrix

It is useful to consider quantities of a $G$-crossed theory that are invariant under gauge transformations, as we did for BTCs. (In this section, we will discuss invariants that are

straightforward to obtain in the $G$-crossed theory, e.g. using diagrammatics, but we will later see that another class of invariants can be constructed by gauging the symmetry of the theory.) Clearly, invariants derived from fusion and $F$-symbols alone are the same in both BTCs and $G$-crossed BTCs, since the new symmetry action gauge transformations do not affect the $F$-symbols. In particular, the quantum dimensions $d_a = d_{\bar{a}} = d_{^{\mathbf{k}}a}$ are invariants.

Eq. (263) with $e = f = 0$ yields the relation

$$\frac{\varkappa_{^{\mathbf{k}}a}}{\varkappa_a} = \frac{\left[F_{^{\mathbf{k}}a}^{^{\mathbf{k}}a\,^{\mathbf{k}}\bar{a}\,^{\mathbf{k}}a}\right]_{00}}{[F_a^{a\bar{a}aa}]_{00}} = \frac{U_{\mathbf{k}}(\,^{\mathbf{k}}\bar{a},\,^{\mathbf{k}}a;0)}{U_{\mathbf{k}}(\,^{\mathbf{k}}a,\,^{\mathbf{k}}\bar{a};0)}. \tag{281}$$

When $a = \bar{a}$, the Frobenius-Shur indicator $\varkappa_a = \pm 1$ is a gauge invariant quantity and it follows from Eq. (281) that $\varkappa_a = \varkappa_{^{\mathbf{k}}a}$. (We recall that, more generally, $\varkappa_a = \varkappa_{\bar{a}}^{-1}$.) When $^{\mathbf{k}}a = a$ is $\mathbf{k}$-invariant, it follows from Eq. (281) that

$$U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,\bar{a};0) = U_{\mathbf{k}}(\bar{a},a;0). \tag{282}$$

On the other hand, we must be more careful when trying to carry over gauge invariant quantities that are derived from braiding operations, such as the twist factors and $S$-matrix, as these may no longer be gauge invariant in a $G$-crossed theory. Consequently, we will examine these in more detail.

The topological twists are defined the same way as before by taking the quantum trace of a counterclockwise braid of a topological charge with itself

$\theta_a = \frac{1}{d_a}$  $= \sum_{c,\mu} \frac{d_c}{d_a} [R_c^{aa}]_{\mu\mu}\,.$ (283)

We immediately see that $\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}$ is always invariant under the vertex basis gauge transformations, but is only invariant under the symmetry action gauge transformations if $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{0}$, since

$$\check{\theta}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} = \gamma_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\mathbf{g})\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}. \tag{284}$$

This corroborates the interpretation of topological charges $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ with $\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{0}$ as describing extrinsic defects, for which one should not expect invariant braiding or exchange statistics in the usual sense, since they are not true quasiparticles (deconfined topological excitations) of the system. We will examine this matter in more detail.

We can immediately notice that

$$\frac{\sum_{\mu} [R_c^{aa}]_{\mu\mu}}{\sum_{\mu'} [R_{c'}^{aa}]_{\mu'\mu'}} \tag{285}$$

is gauge invariant under both types of gauge transformations.

Using Eq. (266) with the definition of the twist, we find the general relation between $\theta_a$ and $\theta_{^{\mathbf{k}}a}$ is

$$\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} = \frac{\eta_{^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}\bar{\mathbf{k}},\mathbf{k})}{\eta_{^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{g})}\theta_{^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}} = \frac{\eta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\bar{\mathbf{k}},\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}\bar{\mathbf{k}})}{\eta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}\theta_{^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}. \tag{286}$$

When $^{\mathbf{k}}a = a$, it follows that

$$\eta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{k}) = \eta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{g}). \tag{287}$$

We also note that Eq. (265) gives $\eta_{^{\mathbf{k}}x}(\mathbf{k},\bar{\mathbf{k}}) = \eta_x(\bar{\mathbf{k}},\mathbf{k})$ for any $x$ and $\mathbf{k}$, so we also have

$$\eta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\mathbf{k},\bar{\mathbf{k}}) = \eta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\bar{\mathbf{k}},\mathbf{k}) \tag{288}$$

when $^{\mathbf{k}}a = a$.

The definition of topological twists can also be written in the form



(289)

as is the case with BTCs. It is clear that the inverse topological twists are similarly obtained from clockwise braidings



(290)

For unitary theories, it is straightforward to see that $\theta_a^{-1} = \theta_a^*$, and hence the topological twist factors must be phases.

Unlike a BTC, it is not necessarily the case that $\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}$ and $\theta_{\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}}$ are equal in a $G$-crossed BTC. In particular, from the following diagrammatic manipulations



(291)



, (292)

we find that they are related through the following expression

$$\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} = U_{\mathbf{g}}(\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}, a_{\mathbf{g}}; 0)\eta_{\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}}(\bar{\mathbf{g}},\mathbf{g})\theta_{\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}}. \tag{293}$$

By evaluating the diagrams on the first line of this sequence, one also finds the relations

$$\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} = U_{\mathbf{g}}(a_{\mathbf{g}}, \overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}; 0)\varkappa_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} \left(R_0^{\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}\right)^{-1} \tag{294}$$

$$= \eta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{g}})^{-1}\varkappa_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}^{-1} \left(R_0^{a_{\mathbf{g}}\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}}\right)^{-1}. \tag{295}$$

We can now derive the $G$-crossed generalization of the ribbon property

$$\sum_{\lambda} \left[R^{b_{\mathbf{h}}\ {}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}\right]_{\mu\lambda} \left[R^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}\right]_{\lambda\nu} = \frac{\theta_c}{\theta_a\theta_b} \frac{[U_{\mathbf{gh}}(a,b;c)]_{\mu\nu}}{\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\eta_b(\mathbf{h},\ {}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}}\mathbf{g})}, \tag{296}$$

which is obtained using the following diagrammatic steps




(297)







(298)

Notice that the first and second lines are related using the pivotal property and we used the Yang-Baxter relation and the fact that lines can slide freely under a twist.

Clearly, the operator $R^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}R^{b_{\mathbf{h}}\ {}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}$ is not gauge invariant, unless $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0}$. However, when ${}^{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}} = a_{\mathbf{g}}$ and ${}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}} = b_{\mathbf{h}}$, the quantities

$$\frac{\sum_{\mu,\nu} \left[R^{b_{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}\right]_{\mu\nu} \left[R^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}\right]_{\nu\mu}}{\sum_{\mu',\nu'} \left[R^{b_{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}_{c'_{\mathbf{gh}}}\right]_{\mu\nu} \left[R^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}_{c'_{\mathbf{gh}}}\right]_{\nu\mu}} \tag{299}$$

are invariant under both types of gauge transformations.

Once again, we define the topological $S$-matrix by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}} &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \; a \; b \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{c,\mu,\nu} d_c \left[R^{b\bar{a}}_{c}\right]_{\mu\nu} \left[R^{\bar{a}b}_{c}\right]_{\nu\mu} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{c,\mu} d_c \frac{\theta_c}{\theta_{\bar{a}}\theta_b} \frac{[U_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}\mathbf{h}}(\bar{a},b;c)]_{\mu\mu}}{\eta_{\bar{a}}(\bar{\mathbf{g}},\mathbf{h})\eta_b(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{g}})}. \end{aligned} \tag{300}$$

We emphasize that, when $a \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ and $b \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{h}}$, the $S$-matrix is only well-defined if ${}^{\mathbf{h}}a = a$ and ${}^{\mathbf{g}}b = b$, and consequently $\mathbf{gh} = \mathbf{hg}$. Otherwise, the topological charge values would change in the braiding and one would not be able to close the lines back upon themselves. We note that we have used $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{g}}$, the total quantum dimension of each subsector $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$, rather than the total quantum dimension $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_G} = |G|^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}$ of the entire $G$-crossed theory $\mathcal{C}_G^{\times}$ for reasons that will be made clear later.

The elements of the $S$-matrix do not obey all the same re-

lations as that of a BTC, nor are they gauge invariant, unless $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0}$, or unless either $a = 0$ or $b = 0$ (in which case $S_{ab} = d_a d_b / \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}$), since

$$\check{S}_{a_{\mathbf{g}} b_{\mathbf{h}}} = \gamma_{\bar{a}}(\mathbf{h}) \gamma_b(\bar{\mathbf{g}}) S_{a_{\mathbf{g}} b_{\mathbf{h}}}. \tag{301}$$

Nonetheless, the $S$-matrix will be an important quantity that again plays an important role in defining the system and modular transformations on higher genus surfaces, so we will examine its properties in detail.

We first note that

$$S_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}\, {}^{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{h}}} = \frac{\eta_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}\bar{a}}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{h}) \eta_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}b}(\mathbf{k}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})}{\eta_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}\bar{a}}(\mathbf{k}\mathbf{h}\bar{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{k}) \eta_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}b}(\mathbf{k}\bar{\mathbf{g}}\bar{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{k})} S_{a_{\mathbf{g}} b_{\mathbf{h}}}, \tag{302}$$

which follows from the definition and Eq. (266). It follows that, when ${}^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}} = {}^{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}} = a_{\mathbf{g}}$ and ${}^{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{h}} = {}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}} = b_{\mathbf{h}}$, we have

$$\frac{\eta_{\bar{a}}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{h}) \eta_b(\mathbf{k}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})}{\eta_{\bar{a}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}) \eta_b(\bar{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{k})} = 1. \tag{303}$$

It is straightforward to see that

$$S^*_{a_{\mathbf{g}} b_{\mathbf{h}}} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}}$$




(304)

for a unitary theory. It also follows immediately from the definition (and the cyclic property of the trace) that

$$S_{a_{\mathbf{g}} b_{\mathbf{h}}} = S_{\overline{b_{\mathbf{h}}} \overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}}. \tag{305}$$

While these $S$-matrix relations are the same as for UBTCs, we must be more careful with properties obtained by deforming lines, because of the nontrivial sliding rules of a $G$-crossed theory.

When ${}^{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}} = a_{\mathbf{g}}$ and ${}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}} = b_{\mathbf{h}}$ (and hence $\mathbf{gh} = \mathbf{hg}$), so that the corresponding $S$-matrix element is well-defined, we have the loop-removal relation




, (306)

which can be verified by closing the $b$ line upon itself in this expression. In fact, if either ${}^{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}} \neq a_{\mathbf{g}}$ or ${}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}} \neq b_{\mathbf{h}}$, then left hand side of the equation evaluates to zero, so, for these purposes, we can consider $S_{ab} = 0$ when it is not well-defined.

In writing this relation, we must be more careful than in a BTC to indicate clearly where the lines are drawn with respect to vertices, including local minima and maxima (cups and caps). Recall that the minima/maxima of the cups/caps correspond to splitting/fusion vertices, respectively, between a topological charge, its conjugate, and the vacuum. Therefore, we see that




. (307)

Since one can equivalently take the trace of Eq. (307) by closing the $b$-line on itself into a loop to the left or right, it leads to the relation

$$S_{a_{\mathbf{g}} b_{\mathbf{h}}} = \frac{U_{\mathbf{h}}(a, \bar{a}; 0)}{\eta_b(\mathbf{g}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})} S^*_{\overline{b_{\mathbf{h}}} a_{\mathbf{g}}}. \tag{308}$$

Combining Eqs. (305) and (308) yields a relation between the $S$-matrix and its transpose

$$S_{a_{\mathbf{g}} b_{\mathbf{h}}} = \frac{U_{\mathbf{h}}(a, \bar{a}; 0) \eta_a(\bar{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{h})}{U_{\mathbf{g}}(b, \bar{b}; 0) \eta_b(\mathbf{g}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})} S_{b_{\mathbf{h}} a_{\mathbf{g}}}. \tag{309}$$

Another useful relation allows us to flip the tilt of a loop encircling another line, as follows




, (310)

in which we used Eqs. (266) and (287).

An important diagrammatic relation, which is the precursor of the $G$-crossed Verlinde formula, is obtained by putting two

loops on a line and using a partition of identity to relate it to a single loop on the line



$$= \sum_{c,\mu} \sqrt{\frac{d_c}{d_a d_b}} = \sum_{c,\mu,\nu} \sqrt{\frac{d_c}{d_a d_b}} \frac{[U_{\mathbf{k}}(\bar{b},\bar{a};\bar{c})]_{\mu\nu}}{\eta_x(\bar{\mathbf{h}},\bar{\mathbf{g}})} = \sum_{c,\mu} \frac{[U_{\mathbf{k}}(\bar{b},\bar{a};\bar{c})]_{\mu\mu}}{\eta_x(\bar{\mathbf{h}},\bar{\mathbf{g}})} \tag{311}$$

Combining Eqs. (311) and (306), we find that when ${}^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}} = a_{\mathbf{g}}$, ${}^{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{h}} = b_{\mathbf{h}}$, and ${}^{\mathbf{g}}x_{\mathbf{k}} = {}^{\mathbf{h}}x_{\mathbf{k}} = x_{\mathbf{k}}$, we have the important relation

$$\frac{S_{a_{\mathbf{g}}x_{\mathbf{k}}}}{S_{0x_{\mathbf{k}}}} \frac{S_{b_{\mathbf{h}}x_{\mathbf{k}}}}{S_{0x_{\mathbf{k}}}} = \sum_{c_{\mathbf{gh}},\mu} \frac{[U_{\mathbf{k}}(\bar{b},\bar{a};\bar{c})]_{\mu\mu}}{\eta_x(\bar{\mathbf{h}},\bar{\mathbf{g}})} \frac{S_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}x_{\mathbf{k}}}}{S_{0x_{\mathbf{k}}}}. \tag{312}$$

We can similarly obtain

$$\frac{S_{x_{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}}{S_{x_{\mathbf{k}}0}} \frac{S_{x_{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}}{S_{x_{\mathbf{k}}0}} = \sum_{c_{\mathbf{gh}},\mu} \frac{[U_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}(a,b;c)]_{\mu\mu}}{\eta_{\bar{x}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \frac{S_{x_{\mathbf{k}}c_{\mathbf{gh}}}}{S_{x_{\mathbf{k}}0}}. \tag{313}$$

If we take $x \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$, these expressions become

$$\frac{S_{a_{\mathbf{g}}x_{\mathbf{0}}} S_{b_{\mathbf{h}}x_{\mathbf{0}}}}{S_{0x_{\mathbf{0}}}} \eta_x(\bar{\mathbf{h}},\bar{\mathbf{g}}) = \sum_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}} N_{ab}^{c} S_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}x_{\mathbf{0}}} \tag{314}$$

$$\frac{S_{x_{\mathbf{0}}a_{\mathbf{g}}} S_{x_{\mathbf{0}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}}{S_{x_{\mathbf{0}}0}} \eta_{\bar{x}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \sum_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}} N_{ab}^{c} S_{x_{\mathbf{0}}c_{\mathbf{gh}}}, \tag{315}$$

which show that one may think of $S_{a_{\mathbf{g}}x_{\mathbf{0}}}/S_{0x_{\mathbf{0}}}$ (or, equivalently, $S_{x_{\mathbf{0}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}/S_{x_{\mathbf{0}}0}$) as projective characters of the extended (non-commutative) Verlinde algebra.

We will now establish several interesting relations that we will find particularly useful for the discussion of modularity. The first is

$$\sum_{a\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}} \frac{d_a\theta_a}{U_{\mathbf{g}}(\bar{a},a;0)} \quad = \frac{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}\Theta_{\mathbf{0}}}{\eta_b(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{g}})\theta_b} \quad , \tag{316}$$



where

$$\Theta_{\mathbf{0}} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{c\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}} d_c^2\theta_c \tag{317}$$

is the normalized Gauss sum of the $\mathcal{C}_0$ BTC. In order to obtain this relation, we use the fact that when $a, b \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$, the $S$-matrix takes the form

$$S_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{g}}} = \frac{1}{\eta_{\bar{a}}(\bar{\mathbf{g}},\mathbf{g})\eta_b(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{g}})} \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{c\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}} N_{\bar{a}b}^{c} d_c \frac{\theta_c}{\theta_{\bar{a}}\theta_b} \tag{318}$$

and therefore obeys the property

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} \frac{d_a\theta_a}{U_{\mathbf{g}}(\bar{a},a;0)} S_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{g}}} &= \frac{1}{\eta_b(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{g}})\theta_b} \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{a_{\mathbf{g}},c_{\mathbf{0}}} N_{\bar{a}b}^{c} d_a d_c \theta_c \\ &= \frac{d_b\Theta_{\mathbf{0}}}{\eta_b(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{g}})\theta_b}, \end{aligned} \tag{319}$$

which is established using Eqs. (228) and (293).

The next relation (which holds even when ${}^{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}} \neq a_{\mathbf{g}}$ or ${}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}} \neq b_{\mathbf{h}}$) is

$$\sum_{x\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}} \frac{d_x\theta_x\eta_{\bar{x}}({}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}}\mathbf{g},\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}}}\mathbf{h})}{U_{\mathbf{gh}}(\bar{x},x;0)}$$




$$= \sum_{\substack{x,c\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}\\ \mu,\nu}} \frac{d_x\theta_x}{U_{\mathbf{gh}}(\bar{x},x;0)}\sqrt{\frac{d_c}{d_a d_b}}\left[U_{\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}}}({}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}}a,\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}}}b;c)\right]_{\mu\nu}$$




$$= \sum_{c_{\mathbf{gh}},\mu,\nu} \sqrt{\frac{d_c}{d_a d_b}}\left[U_{\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}}}({}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}}a,\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}}}b;c)\right]_{\mu\nu}\frac{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}\Theta_{\mathbf{0}}}{\eta_c(\mathbf{gh},\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}})\theta_c}$$




$$= \frac{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}\Theta_{\mathbf{0}}}{\theta_a\theta_b\eta_a(\mathbf{gh},\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}})\eta_b(\mathbf{gh},\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}})\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\eta_b(\mathbf{h},\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}}\mathbf{g})}$$




, (320)

which is obtained by using Eq. (316), the relation

$$\left[U_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}({}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}a,\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}b;\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}c)\right]_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\eta_c(\mathbf{k},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}{\eta_a(\mathbf{k},\bar{\mathbf{k}})\eta_b(\mathbf{k},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}\left[U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,b;c)^{-1}\right]_{\mu\nu}, \tag{321}$$

[which is the sliding move consistency Eq. (260) with $\mathbf{l}=\bar{\mathbf{k}}$,] and the (inverse of the) the ribbon property given in Eq. (296).

Finally, when ${}^{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}} = a_{\mathbf{g}}$ (which requires $\mathbf{gh}=\mathbf{hg}$), we have the relation

$$\sum_{x\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}} \frac{d_x\theta_x\eta_{\bar{x}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}{U_{\mathbf{gh}}(\bar{x},x;0)}$$




$$= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}} \frac{d_x\theta_x\eta_{\bar{x}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}{U_{\mathbf{gh}}(\bar{x},x;0)}\frac{U_{\mathbf{g}}(x,\bar{x};0)}{\eta_a(\mathbf{gh},\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}})}\frac{\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{g}})}{U_{\mathbf{gh}}(a,\bar{a};0)}$$




$$= \frac{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}\Theta_{\mathbf{0}}\eta_b(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{g}})}{\theta_a\theta_b U_{\mathbf{h}}(a,\bar{a};0)\eta_a(\mathbf{gh},\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}})\eta_b(\mathbf{gh},\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}})\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\eta_b(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g})}$$




. (322)

To obtain these relations, we used Eqs. (307) and (316) in both lines, though, in the second line, we first applied Eq. (320). We emphasize that the individual diagrams in this equation evaluate to zero, unless ${}^{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}} = a_{\mathbf{g}}$, ${}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}} = b_{\mathbf{h}}$, and ${}^{\mathbf{g}}x_{\mathbf{gh}} = {}^{\mathbf{h}}x_{\mathbf{gh}} = x_{\mathbf{gh}}$. In particular, the sum here can be taken to be over $x_{\mathbf{gh}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}^{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}^{\mathbf{g}} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}^{\mathbf{h}}$, the topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}$ that are both $\mathbf{g}$-invariant and $\mathbf{h}$-invariant, where we define the invariant topological charge subsets

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}^{\mathbf{h}} = \{\ a\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}} \mid {}^{\mathbf{h}}a = a\ \}. \tag{323}$$

Taking the trace of Eq. (322), i.e. closing the $b$-line back on itself (which requires ${}^{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}} = b_{\mathbf{h}}$), we finally obtain the important relation

$$\sum_{x\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}} \eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}\frac{S_{a_{\mathbf{g}}x_{\mathbf{gh}}}}{U_{\mathbf{gh}}(a,\bar{a};0)}\eta_x(\mathbf{gh},\bar{\mathbf{g}})\theta_{x_{\mathbf{gh}}}\frac{S_{x_{\mathbf{gh}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}}{U_{\mathbf{h}}(x,\bar{x};0)}\eta_b(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}})\theta_{b_{\mathbf{h}}} = \Theta_{\mathbf{0}}\frac{S_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}}{U_{\mathbf{h}}(a,\bar{a};0)}. \tag{324}$$

In order to manipulate the trace of Eq. (322) into this form, we have used the relations

$$\eta_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})\eta_{\bar{a}}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}) = \frac{U_{\mathbf{kl}}(a,\bar{a};0)}{U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,\bar{a};0)U_{\mathbf{l}}({}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}a,\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}\bar{a};0)}, \quad (325)$$

$$\eta_x(\mathbf{gh},\bar{\mathbf{g}}) = \frac{\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{g}})}{\eta_{{}^{\mathbf{g}}x}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}, \quad (326)$$

$$\eta_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}b}(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}}) = \frac{\eta_b(\mathbf{gh},\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}})\eta_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}{\eta_b(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{g}})}, \quad (327)$$

the first of which is the sliding move consistency Eq. (260) with $c = 0$, while the second and third are special cases of Eq. (265).

We conclude this section by noting that a number of additional $G$-crossed gauge invariant quantities will naturally arise in the context of modular transformations of the $G$-crossed theory and gauging the symmetry of theory. As these quantities would be somewhat out of context and mysterious here, we leave their discussion for the subsequent Secs. VII and VIII.

## VII. $G$-CROSSED MODULARITY

An important property of a topological phase of matter is the ground state degeneracy when the system inhabits manifolds with different topologies. For a $2+1$ dimensional topological phase, the ground state degeneracy will depend on the genus $g$ of the surface inhabited by the system and the topological charge values of the quasiparticles (and boundaries) of the system. More generally, it is important that the theory describing a topological phase is well-defined and consistent for the system on arbitrary topologies. In other words, the topological properties of the system are described by a TQFT. In terms of the BTC theory, this is achieved by requiring the theory to be a modular tensor category (MTC), i.e. to have unitary $S$-matrix. In this case, the $S$-matrix and $T$-matrix provide a projective representation of the modular transformations for the system on the torus. (More general modular transformations for the system on a manifold of arbitrary topology and quasiparticle content can similarly be defined in terms of the MTC properties.)

We wish to establish a similar notion of modularity for $G$-crossed BTCs, which allows one to relate the theory to a $G$-crossed TQFT that describes the topological phase with defects on arbitrary 2D surfaces. The $G$-crossed extended defect theory $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ admits a richer set of possibilities, as defect branch lines can wrap the nontrivial cycles of surfaces with genus $g > 0$, thus giving rise to "twisted" sectors. For $G$-crossed modularity, we will require that the set of $\mathbf{g}$-defect topological charges $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$ is finite for each $\mathbf{g} \in G$ (though not necessarily that $G$ is finite or even discrete). Some special cases of $G$-crossed modular transformations have been studied recently in Refs. [131, 132].

In this section, we will develop an understanding of the twisted sectors and their associated topological ground state degeneracies. We also establish the notion of $G$-crossed modularity and the corresponding modular transformations for the system when it includes twisted sectors. The topological ground state degeneracies of the defect sectors, together with the $G$-crossed modular transformations, can provide valuable information about the symmetry-enriched topological order.

### A. $G$-Crossed Verlinde Formula and $\omega_a$-Loops

Before considering the $G$-crossed theory and modular transformations for a system on surfaces with genus $g > 0$, we first investigate some properties that are closely related to modularity, namely the Verlinde formula and $\omega_a$-loops. For this, we begin with the minimal assumption that the original theory $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ is a MTC, which is to say that its $S$-matrix is unitary. From this assumption and Eqs. (314) and (315), we obtain the formula

$$N_{a_\mathbf{g} b_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}}^{c_\mathbf{0}} = \sum_{x_\mathbf{0}\in\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}^\mathbf{g}} \frac{S_{a_\mathbf{g}x_\mathbf{0}}S_{b_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}x_\mathbf{0}}S^*_{c_\mathbf{0}x_\mathbf{0}}}{S_{0x_\mathbf{0}}}\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{g}}) \quad (328)$$

$$= \sum_{x_\mathbf{0}\in\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}^\mathbf{g}} \frac{S_{x_\mathbf{0}a_\mathbf{g}}S_{x_\mathbf{0}b_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}}S^*_{x_\mathbf{0}c_\mathbf{0}}}{S_{x_\mathbf{0}0}}\eta_{\bar{x}}(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{g}}), \quad (329)$$

where the sums in these expressions are over the subset $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}^\mathbf{g}$ of $\mathbf{g}$-invariant topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$. (Actually, we could let the sums go over the entire $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ if we consider the $S$-matrices to be equal to zero when ${}^\mathbf{g}x \neq x$.)

Setting $c = 0$ in these expressions and using Eqs. (305) and (308), we obtain

$$\delta_{a_\mathbf{g}a'_\mathbf{g}} = \sum_{x_\mathbf{0}\in\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}^\mathbf{g}} S_{a_\mathbf{g}x_\mathbf{0}}S^*_{a'_\mathbf{g}x_\mathbf{0}} = \sum_{x_\mathbf{0}\in\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}^\mathbf{g}} S_{x_\mathbf{0}a_\mathbf{g}}S^*_{x_\mathbf{0}a'_\mathbf{g}}. \quad (330)$$

Now, we can use Eq. (330) with Eqs. (314) and (315) to obtain the $G$-crossed Verlinde formula

$$N_{a_\mathbf{g}b_\mathbf{h}}^{c_\mathbf{gh}} = \sum_{x_\mathbf{0}\in\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}^{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}} \frac{S_{a_\mathbf{g}x_\mathbf{0}}S_{b_\mathbf{h}x_\mathbf{0}}S^*_{c_\mathbf{gh}x_\mathbf{0}}}{S_{0x_\mathbf{0}}}\eta_x(\bar{\mathbf{h}},\bar{\mathbf{g}}) \quad (331)$$

$$= \sum_{x_\mathbf{0}\in\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}^{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}} \frac{S_{x_\mathbf{0}a_\mathbf{g}}S_{x_\mathbf{0}b_\mathbf{h}}S^*_{x_\mathbf{0}c_\mathbf{gh}}}{S_{x_\mathbf{0}0}}\eta_{\bar{x}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}), \quad (332)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}^{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} = \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}^\mathbf{g} \cap \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}^\mathbf{h}$ is the subset of topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ that are both $\mathbf{g}$-invariant and $\mathbf{h}$-invariant.

Moreover, we may use these properties to define $\omega_{a_\mathbf{g}}$-loops, which are linear combinations of loops of topological charge lines that act as topological charge projectors on the collection of topological charge lines passing through them. [These should not to be confused with the $\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ phase factors associated with symmetry fractionalization in Sec. IV, nor should $\omega_{a_\mathbf{g}}$ be confused with an element of $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$.] Similar to their definition in MTCs, the $\omega_{a_\mathbf{g}}$-loops in a $G$-crossed theory are defined by




(333)




FIG. 10: A topological phase described by the MTC $\mathcal{C}$ on a torus has ground state degeneracy equal to the number of distinct topological charge types $|\mathcal{C}|$. A basis for the degenerate ground state subspace is provided by the states $|a\rangle_l$ which have definite topological charge value $a$ ascribed to the charge line passing through the interior of the torus around the longitudinal cycle. Alternatively, a basis is provided by the states $|b\rangle_m$ which have definite topological charge value $b$ ascribed to the charge line passing through the exterior of the torus around the meridional cycle. These two bases are related by the modular $S$ transformation, which is represented in a MTC by the topological $S$-matrix, giving $|a\rangle_l = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{C}} S_{ab}|b\rangle_m$.




FIG. 11: A topological charge measurement around a meridional loop for the state $|a\rangle_l$ yields the measurement result $a$. Similarly, if one cuts open the torus along the meridian for the state $|a\rangle_l$, the two resulting boundaries will have charges $a$ and $\bar{a}$, respectively.

where the first equality is a definition, and the last step used Eqs. (306) and (330) to show that act on $\mathbf{g}$-defects as projectors that distinguish between the different topological charge values of $\mathbf{g}$-defects. Eq. (333) establishes our previous claim in Sec. V B that, when the original theory $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ is modular, there are physical processes involving the $\mathbf{g}$-invariant topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ which are able to distinguish between the distinct types of $\mathbf{g}$-defects.

It is worth re-emphasizing that, so far, we have only assumed that $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ is modular (i.e. has unitary $S$-matrix), and made no further assumption about the $S$-matrix of the extended $G$-crossed theory. The results here seem to suggest that it may be the case that requiring $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ to be modular would be sufficient to obtain a notion of modularity of the $G$-crossed theory. Indeed, by combining theorems from Refs. [80, 133] that relate $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ to the theory $\mathcal{C}/G$ obtained by gauging the symmetry, one has the property that $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ is a MTC if and only if $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ is $G$-crossed modular (both of which are true if and only if $\mathcal{C}/G$ is a MTC). We now define the notion of a $G$-crossed BTC being $G$-crossed modular in the following subsection.

### B. Torus Degeneracy and $G$-Crossed Modular Transformations

When a topological phase of matter characterized by a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$ inhabits a torus, it possesses a topologically protected ground state degeneracy equal to the number of distinct topological charges in $\mathcal{C}$. More specifically, a basis for this degenerate ground state subspace on the torus is given by the states $|a\rangle_l$, which are, respectively, identified as having the definite topological charge value $a \in \mathcal{C}$ ascribed to the charge line passing through the interior of the torus around the longitudinal cycle, as indicated in Fig. 10. In other words, if one were to perform a topological charge measurement along a loop around the meridian of the torus, the resulting measurement value would be $a$ for the state $|a\rangle_l$. This is equivalent to cutting open the torus along the meridian and inspecting the resulting topological charge value on the resulting boundaries, which would be found to be $a$ and $\bar{a}$ for the basis state $|a\rangle_l$, as shown in Fig. 11. Along these lines, the ground state $|a\rangle_l$ can be obtained from the ground state $|0\rangle_l$ by adiabatically creating a pair of quasiparticles with topological charges $a$ and $\bar{a}$, respectively, from vacuum, transporting the charge $a$ quasiparticle around the longitudinal cycle (in the positive sense), and then pair annihilating the quasiparticles (fusing them back into vacuum).

Alternatively, one may interchange the roles of the longitudinal and meridional cycles of the torus. In this way, we can equivalently define a basis for the ground state subspace by $|b\rangle_m$, which are, respectively, identified as having the definite topological charge value $a \in \mathcal{C}$ ascribed to the charge line passing through the exterior of the torus around the meridional cycle, as indicated in Fig. 10. These two bases are related by the modular $S$ transformation, which interchanges the cycles of the torus (and flips the direction of one of them). As mentioned in Sec. II B, the $S$-matrix of a MTC provides a (projective) representation of the modular $S$ transformation, where the bases are related by

$$|a\rangle_l = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{C}} S_{ab}|b\rangle_m. \tag{334}$$

This relation is motivated by the observation of the $a$ and $b$ topological charge lines passing around the complementary cycles of the torus forming linked loops, as in the topological $S$-matrix.

In order to generate all modular transformations on the torus, we additionally consider the modular $T$ transformations, known as Dehn twists. This transformation replaces the longitudinal cycle around the torus with one that wraps once (in the positive direction) around the longitude and once around the meridian (in the positive direction), as shown in Fig. 12. We can, alternatively, think of this transformation as being obtained by cutting open the torus along a meridian, twisting the torus by $2\pi$ around the longitudinal axis, and gluing it back together, so that a $2\pi$ twist has been introduced. Providing the topological charge line $a$ with a framing, which




FIG. 12: The modular $T$ transformation, known as a Dehn twist, replaces the longitudinal cycle with a cycle (shown here in black) that wraps once around the longitude and once around the meridian. Such transformations are represented in a MTC by the topological twists, i.e. $T_{ab} = \theta_b \delta_{ab}$, and relate the basis states $|a\rangle_l$ to the basis defined with respect to the longitude plus meridian basis states $|a\rangle_{l+m}$ through the relation $|a\rangle_l = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{C}} T_{ab}|b\rangle_{l+m}$.

is equivalent to drawing a line on the surface of the torus running parallel to the $a$ line around the longitudinal cycle, we see that this transformation puts a twist in the framing ribbon of the charge line. This ribbon twist, which one can equate to the topological twist, motivates the definition $T_{ab} = \theta_b \delta_{ab}$ in the transformation

$$|a\rangle_l = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{C}} T_{ab}|b\rangle_{l+m}, \tag{335}$$

since a $2\pi$ twist must be introduced to go from the basis states $|a\rangle_{l+m}$ to the basis states $|a\rangle_l$, and such a twist does not change the topological charge value that wraps around the longitudinal cycle.

As mentioned in Sec. II B, when the $S$-matrix of a UBTC is unitary, the theory is considered modular, as the $S$ and $T$ matrices provide a projective representation of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$, the modular transformations on a torus, i.e.

$$(ST)^3 = \Theta C, \quad S^2 = C, \quad C^2 = \mathbb{1}, \tag{336}$$

where $C_{ab} = \delta_{a\bar{b}}$ is the topological charge conjugation operator. In this case, one may also define the corresponding modular transformations for punctured torii, and consequently, the theory can be consistently defined on arbitrary surfaces.

In the defect theory described by a $G$-crossed BTC $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, the situation becomes more complicated. Clearly, the $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ subcategory, which describes the original topological phase without defects, must behave exactly the same as described above. In other words, when $S_{a_\mathbf{0}b_\mathbf{0}}$ is a unitary matrix (when restricted to topological charge labels $a, b \in \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$), so that $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ is a UMTC, the ground states on a torus without defect branches are described exactly as above and the operators $S_{a_\mathbf{0}b_\mathbf{0}}$ and $T_{a_\mathbf{0}b_\mathbf{0}} = \theta_{b_\mathbf{0}}\delta_{a_\mathbf{0}b_\mathbf{0}}$ provide a projective representation of the modular transformations in the subtheory without defects. We call this restriction to the defect-free theory on the torus the $(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})$-sector and denote the corresponding modular transformations defined in this way as $\mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})}$ and $\mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})}$.

When we allow for the inclusion of defects in the theory, we can produce twisted sectors on the torus, each of which is labeled by two group elements $\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h} \in G$, which correspond to defect branch lines that, respectively, wind around the two non-contractible cycles of the torus, as shown in Fig. 13. The original UMTC $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ is described by the trivial twist sector $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = (\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})$. One can obtain a state in the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-twisted sector from the $(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})$-sector by adiabatically creating a $\mathbf{h},\mathbf{h}^{-1}$ defect pair from vacuum, transporting the $\mathbf{h}$-defect around the meridional cycle (in the positive sense), pair annihilating the defect pair, and then doing the same process with an $\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^{-1}$ defect pair winding around the longitudinal cycle. This is only possible when




FIG. 13: The $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-twisted sector on a torus, where a closed $\mathbf{g}$-defect branch line wraps around the longitudinal cycle of the torus and a $\mathbf{h}$-defect branch line wraps around the meridional cycle of the torus. A basis for the degenerate ground state subspace of the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-twisted sector is given by the states $|a_\mathbf{g}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}\rangle_l$ corresponding to definite topological charge value $a_\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}^\mathbf{h}$ ascribed to a charge line passing through the interior of the torus around the longitudinal cycle. Alternatively, one may consider this to be a $(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{g}})$-twisted sector on a torus by interchanging the roles of the longitudinal and meridional cycles. In this case, a basis for the ground state subspace is given by the states $|b_\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{g}})}\rangle_m$ corresponding to definite topological charge $b_\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{h}^\mathbf{g}$ ascribed to the charge line passing through the exterior of the torus around the meridional cycle. These two bases are related by the modular $\mathcal{S}$ transformation $|a_\mathbf{g}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}\rangle_l = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{h}^\mathbf{g}} \mathcal{S}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{h}}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} |b_\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{g}})}\rangle_m$.

$$\mathbf{gh} = \mathbf{hg}, \tag{337}$$

since otherwise the group element ascribed to the defects would necessarily change type as they crossed the other defect branch line wrapping around the complementary cycle, making it impossible to pair-annihilate the defects or close the branch line on itself. In this way, we see that the topological charge line that runs through the interior of the torus around the longitudinal cycle can only take values in $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$, since it must be created by a $\mathbf{g}$-defect encircling the cycle. Moreover, this topological charge must be $\mathbf{h}$-invariant, since the charge lines cross the $\mathbf{h}$-branch. Similarly, the topological charge line that runs through the exterior of the torus around the meridional cycle can only take $\mathbf{g}$-invariant topological charge values in $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{h}$. It is clear that states from different $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-sectors cannot be superposed, since the defects are extrinsic, confined objects, which can be thought of as defining distinct superselection sectors.

We label the ground state subspace associated with the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-sector of the system on a torus as $\mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}$. Similar to UMTCs, a basis for $\mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}$ is given by states $|a_\mathbf{g}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}\rangle_l$ corresponding to definite topological charge value $a_\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}^\mathbf{h}$ ascribed to a charge line passing through the interior of the torus




FIG. 14: The modular $\mathcal{T}$ transformation (Dehn twist) maps between the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-sector on a torus to the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{gh})$-sector shown here. This transformation acts diagonally (i.e. with relative phases) between bases for the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ and $(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{h})$ sectors, both of which are labeled by topological charge values $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ ascribed to the topological charge line passing through the interior of the torus around the longitudinal cycle. These two bases are related by $|a_{\mathbf{g}}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}\rangle_l = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}^{\mathbf{h}}} \mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{g}}} |b_{\mathbf{g}}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{gh})}\rangle_{l+m}$

around the longitudinal cycle. For a $G$-crossed theory, if we interchange the roles of the longitudinal and meridional cycles (and flip one of their directions), corresponding to a modular $\mathcal{S}$ transformation, then the system from this perspective is in the $(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{g}})$-twisted sector on a torus. In this case, a basis for the ground state subspace is given by the states $|b_{\mathbf{h}}^{(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{g}})}\rangle_m$ corresponding to definite topological charge $b_{\mathbf{h}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{h}}^{\mathbf{g}}$ ascribed to the charge line passing through the exterior of the torus around the meridional cycle. Thus, there must be a unitary operator relating these two bases which represents the modular $\mathcal{S}$ transformation between the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ and $(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{g}})$ sectors. In particular, this takes the form

$$|a_{\mathbf{g}}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}\rangle_l = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{h}}^{\mathbf{g}}} \mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}} |b_{\mathbf{h}}^{(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{g}})}\rangle_m. \tag{338}$$

Similarly, the modular $\mathcal{T}$ transformation (Dehn twist) takes the system between the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ and $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{gh})$ sectors, as indicated in Fig. 14, with basis states related by

$$|a_{\mathbf{g}}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}\rangle_l = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}^{\mathbf{h}}} \mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{g}}} |b_{\mathbf{g}}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{gh})}\rangle_{l+m}. \tag{339}$$

Thus, we can write the modular $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ transformations for a $G$-crossed theory in the form

$$\mathcal{S} = \bigoplus_{\{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\,|\,\mathbf{gh}=\mathbf{hg}\}} \mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \tag{340}$$

$$\mathcal{T} = \bigoplus_{\{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\,|\,\mathbf{gh}=\mathbf{hg}\}} \mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}, \tag{341}$$

where these transformations map from one twisted sector to another (without mixing sectors)

$$\mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} : \mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \to \mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{g}})} \tag{342}$$

$$\mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} : \mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \to \mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{gh})}. \tag{343}$$

For example, the $G$-crossed modular transformations for $G=\mathbb{Z}_2=\{0,1\}$ take the block form

$$\mathcal{S} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} \mathcal{S}^{(0,0)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & \mathcal{S}^{(0,1)} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \mathcal{S}^{(1,0)} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathcal{S}^{(1,1)} \end{array}\right], \tag{344}$$

$$\mathcal{T} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} \mathcal{T}^{(0,0)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \mathcal{T}^{(0,1)} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathcal{T}^{(1,0)} \\ \hline 0 & 0 & \mathcal{T}^{(1,1)} & 0 \end{array}\right], \tag{345}$$

where the rows and columns are separated into $(0,0)$, $(0,1)$, $(1,0)$, and $(1,1)$ sectors, in that order.

Thus, imposing unitarity on the representations of the modular $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ transformations amounts to imposing unitarity on their restricted actions $\mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}$ and $\mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}$ for each $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-sector individually. Since the system in the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-sector has a ground state degeneracy

$$\mathcal{N}_{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} = \dim \mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} = |\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}^{\mathbf{h}}| \tag{346}$$

equal to the number of $\mathbf{h}$-invariant topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$, it follows that requiring the modular transformations to be unitary gives the condition that

$$|\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{h}}^{\mathbf{g}}| = |\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}^{\mathbf{h}}|, \tag{347}$$

whenever $\mathbf{gh}=\mathbf{hg}$. In particular, for $\mathbf{h}=\mathbf{0}$, this gives us the important property

$$|\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}| = |\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathbf{g}}|, \tag{348}$$

which says the number of topologically distinct types of $\mathbf{g}$-defects (i.e. the topological charge types in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$) is equal to the number of $\mathbf{g}$-invariant topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$.

We now wish to provide a projective representation of the modular transformations that are defined by the $G$-crossed UBTC data. Let us take the representation of the modular transformations defined by

$$\mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}} = \frac{S_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}}{U_{\mathbf{h}}(a,\bar{a};0)} \tag{349}$$

$$\mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{g}}} = \eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}\delta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{g}}}. \tag{350}$$

Recall that $S_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}$ is the topological $S$-matrix defined in (300). It is convenient for us to also define the $G$-crossed "charge conjugation" transformation

$$C = \bigoplus_{\{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}):\,\mathbf{gh}=\mathbf{hg}\}} C^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \tag{351}$$

$$C^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} : \mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \to \mathcal{V}_{(\bar{\mathbf{g}},\bar{\mathbf{h}})} \tag{352}$$

$$|a_{\mathbf{g}}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}\rangle_l = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{C}_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}^{\mathbf{h}}} C^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}} |b_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}^{(\bar{\mathbf{g}},\bar{\mathbf{h}})}\rangle_{-l} \tag{353}$$

$$C^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}} = \frac{1}{U_{\mathbf{h}}(\bar{b},b;0)\eta_b(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{h}})}\delta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}\overline{b_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}}}. \tag{354}$$

Given the properties derived for a general $G$-crossed UBTC in Sec. VI, we can obtain the relation

$$\sum_{w,x,y,z} \mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} w_\mathbf{g}} \mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{gh})}_{w_\mathbf{g} x_\mathbf{gh}} \mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{gh},\bar{\mathbf{g}})}_{x_\mathbf{gh} y_\mathbf{gh}} \mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{h})}_{y_\mathbf{gh} z_\mathbf{h}} \mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}})}_{z_\mathbf{h} b_\mathbf{h}} = \Theta_\mathbf{0} \mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{h}} \tag{355}$$

from Eq. (324), where $\Theta_\mathbf{0} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_\mathbf{0}} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}} d_c^2 \theta_c$, the relation

$$\mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{h}} = \sum_x \left[ \mathcal{S}^{(\bar{\mathbf{h}},\mathbf{g})}_{x_{\bar{\mathbf{h}}} a_\mathbf{g}} \right]^* C^{(\bar{\mathbf{h}},\mathbf{g})}_{x_{\bar{\mathbf{h}}} b_\mathbf{h}} \tag{356}$$

from Eq. (308), and the relation

$$\sum_x C^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} x_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}} C^{(\bar{\mathbf{g}},\bar{\mathbf{h}})}_{x_{\bar{\mathbf{g}}} b_\mathbf{g}} = \delta_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{g}}, \tag{357}$$

from Eq. (260). Thus, without imposing unitarity of the topological $S$-matrix nor any other extra conditions on a $G$-crossed UBTC, the transformations defined by Eqs. (349), (350), and (354) obey the relations

$$(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{T})^3 = \Theta_\mathbf{0} \mathcal{S}^2 \tag{358}$$

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^\dagger C \tag{359}$$

$$C^2 = \mathbb{1}. \tag{360}$$

We can also show that

$$C\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}C \tag{361}$$

using Eqs. (305) and (309), and that

$$C\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}C \tag{362}$$

using Eqs. (293) and (325)-(327).

It is clear from these relations that all that is needed for these operators to provide a projective representation of the modular transformations is to impose a condition on the topological $S$-matrix that makes the modular operator $\mathcal{S}$ defined by Eq. (349) unitary, in which case Eq. (359) would become

$$\mathcal{S}^2 = C. \tag{363}$$

We can see that requiring $\mathcal{S}$ to be unitary is equivalent to the condition that the topological $S$-matrix of the $G$-crossed UBTC gives unitary matrices when it is $G$-graded, by which we mean that for any fixed pair of group elements $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{h}$, the matrix defined by $S_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{h}}$ with indices $a \in \mathcal{C}^\mathbf{h}_\mathbf{g}$ and $b \in \mathcal{C}^\mathbf{g}_\mathbf{h}$ is a unitary matrix. Thus, when the topological $S$-matrix of a $G$-crossed UBTC $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ is $G$-graded unitary (in the fashion described here), we say that $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ is $G$-crossed modular or that it is a $G$-crossed modular tensor category (MTC).

We note that, for a modular theory, the quantity

$$\Theta_\mathbf{0} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_\mathbf{0}} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}} d_c^2 \theta_c = e^{i \frac{2\pi}{8} c_-} \tag{364}$$

is a phase related to $c_-$ which is the chiral central charge of the topological phase described by the UMTC $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$. Thus, we can ascribe the same chiral central charge to the $G$-crossed extensions of a topological phase.

It follows from the definition of $G$-crossed modularity that the $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ subcategory of a $G$-crossed MTC is a MTC. As previously mentioned, the converse is also true, as can be shown by combining highly nontrivial theorems from Refs. [80, 133]. Thus, the conditions of modularity of a UBTC and its $G$-crossed extensions are equivalent, i.e. $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ is a $G$-crossed UMTC if and only if $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ is a UMTC.

We note that, just as in the case of a MTC, we could actually obtain a linear (rather than projective) representation of the modular transformations on the torus if we instead defined the Dehn twist transformation to be given by

$$\mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{g}} = e^{-i \frac{2\pi}{24} c_-} \eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \theta_{a_\mathbf{g}} \delta_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{g}}, \tag{365}$$

as this would give the relation $(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{T})^3 = \mathcal{S}^2$. This convention may be more useful when performing concrete calculations or physical simulations on the torus. However, it is not generally possible to trivialize the projective phases for the representations of modular transformations for higher genus surfaces, so we will not generally include the central charge dependent phase.

We also note that the quantities representing the $G$-crossed modular $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ transformations defined here are not gauge invariant, except in the $(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})$-sector (which was also the case with the topological twists and $S$-matrix in the $G$-crossed theory). In particular, while they are invariant under vertex basis gauge transformations, they transform under symmetry action gauge transformations as

$$\check{\mathcal{S}}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{h}} = \frac{\gamma_b(\bar{\mathbf{g}})}{\gamma_a(\mathbf{h})} \mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{h}} \tag{366}$$

$$\check{\mathcal{T}}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{g}} = \frac{\gamma_b(\mathbf{gh})}{\gamma_a(\mathbf{h})} \mathcal{T}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{g}}. \tag{367}$$

This is not unexpected, since these two modular transformations map the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-sector to the $(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{g}})$-sector and the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{gh})$-sector, respectively, and there is no well-defined gauge invariant notion of comparing distinct superselection sectors, i.e. there is no canonical map between different sectors. (This is related to the fact that the defects are extrinsic objects which define different superselection sectors for different group elements and for which one should not expect overall phases to be well-defined.) As such, it is important to be careful with the details of how one sets up configurations and analyzes their modular transformations when working on a torus or higher genus system.

On the other hand, we may expect some modular transformations to be gauge invariant [in addition to the $(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})$-sectors]. From Eqs. (366) and (367), and the fact that $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ generate the modular transformations on the torus, it follows that a general modular transformation $\mathcal{Q}$ that maps the $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-sector to the $(\mathbf{g}',\mathbf{h}')$-sector, i.e.

$$\mathcal{Q}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} : \mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \to \mathcal{V}_{(\mathbf{g}',\mathbf{h}')}, \tag{368}$$

transforms under symmetry action gauge transformations as

$$\check{\mathcal{Q}}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_{\mathbf{g}'}} = \frac{\gamma_b(\mathbf{h}')}{\gamma_a(\mathbf{h})} \mathcal{Q}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_{\mathbf{g}'}}. \tag{369}$$

From this expression, it is easy to see that (a) if a modular transformation $\mathcal{Q}$ maps a $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-sector to itself, then $\mathcal{Q}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} a_\mathbf{g}}$ is a gauge invariant quantity and (b) if $\mathcal{Q}$ maps a $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0})$-sector to itself, then $\mathcal{Q}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{g}}$ is a gauge invariant quantity.

For example, if $\mathbf{g}^n = \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathcal{T}^n$ will map a $(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$-sector to itself, and the coefficients

$$[\mathcal{T}^n]^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}_{a_\mathbf{g} a_\mathbf{g}} = \theta^n_{a_\mathbf{g}} \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \eta_{a_\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}^j\mathbf{h}) \tag{370}$$

provide gauge invariant quantities of the $G$-crossed theory (for any $\mathbf{h}$ that commutes with $\mathbf{g}$). If $\mathbf{g}^2 = \mathbf{0}$, we see that

$$\mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})}_{a_\mathbf{g} a_\mathbf{g}} = \frac{S_{a_\mathbf{g} a_\mathbf{g}}}{U_\mathbf{g}(a,\bar{a};0)} \tag{371}$$

$$[\mathcal{S}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}]^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{g}} = \sum_{x_\mathbf{0}} \frac{S_{a_\mathbf{g} x_\mathbf{0}} \theta_{x_\mathbf{0}} S_{x_\mathbf{0} b_\mathbf{g}}}{U_\mathbf{g}(x,\bar{x};0)} \tag{372}$$

$$[\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{T}]^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0})}_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{g}} = \frac{\theta_{a_\mathbf{g}} S_{a_\mathbf{g} b_\mathbf{g}} \theta_{b_\mathbf{g}} \eta_b(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})}{U_\mathbf{g}(a,\bar{a};0)} \tag{373}$$

are also gauge invariant quantities [the last two are, of course, not independent, given Eq. (358)].

### C. Higher Genus Surfaces

When the system is on a genus $g$ surface, the topological ground state degeneracy is more complicated. In general, it can be obtained by summing over the possible states associated with a fusion tree of topological charge lines that pass through either the interior or exterior of the surface, and which encircle independent non-contractible cycles, as shown in Fig. 15. For a UMTC (without defects), this leads to the ground state degeneracy

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_g &= \sum_{\{b,z,c\}\in\mathcal{C}} N^{c_{12}}_{z_1 z_2} N^{c_{123}}_{c_{12} z_3} \cdots N^{0}_{c_{1\ldots g-1} z_g} \prod_{j=1}^{g} N^{z_j}_{a_j \overline{a_j}} \\ &= \mathcal{D}_\mathbf{0}^{2g-2} \sum_{x\in\mathcal{C}} d_x^{-(2g-2)},\end{aligned} \tag{374}$$

where the evaluation may be carried out using the Verlinde formula.

For a topological phase with defects, described by a $G$-crossed UMTC $\mathcal{C}^\times_G$, the system on a genus $g$ surface may have defect branch lines around any non-contractible loop, similar to the case of the torus. In this case, we can label the distinct twisted sectors of a genus $g$ surface by $2g$ group elements, $\{\mathbf{g}_j,\mathbf{h}_j\}$, $j = 1,\ldots,g$, each of which corresponds to a defect branch line wrapping around an independent generating cycle. We write the corresponding ground state subspace as $\mathcal{V}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j,\mathbf{h}_j\}}$. The group elements $\{\mathbf{g}_j,\mathbf{h}_j\}$ must satisfy relations to ensure that the corresponding defect branch lines can close consistently upon themselves. In this case, we do not require that $\mathbf{g}_j$ and $\mathbf{h}_j$ necessarily commute. When they do not, one of the branch lines at a given handle may have its group element label change as it crosses the other branch line. If we pick the $\mathbf{h}_j$-branch lines to close around their cycles unchanged, then the $\mathbf{g}_j$ branch lines transform into $\mathbf{h}_j^{-1}\mathbf{g}_j\mathbf{h}_j$ branch lines when they cross the $\mathbf{h}_j$-branch. When this branch line loops back on itself, we are left with a nontrivial branch line, which requires a $\mathbf{k}_j$-branch line, where

$$\mathbf{k}_j = \mathbf{g}_j\mathbf{h}_j^{-1}\mathbf{g}_j^{-1}\mathbf{h}_j, \tag{375}$$

to enter the handle and cancel this off, as shown in Fig. 15.

Thus, while we do not require $\mathbf{g}_j$ and $\mathbf{h}_j$ to commute, we do, however, require that the product of their commutators $\mathbf{k}_j$ equals the identity group element, that is

$$\prod_{j=1}^{g} \mathbf{k}_j = \prod_{j=1}^{g} \mathbf{g}_j\mathbf{h}_j^{-1}\mathbf{g}_j^{-1}\mathbf{h}_j = \mathbf{0}, \tag{376}$$

as this condition is necessary for a consistent configuration of branch lines that do not contain any free endpoints, as can be seen from Fig. 15.

A basis for the ground state subspace $\mathcal{V}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j,\mathbf{h}_j\}}$ of the $\{\mathbf{g}_j,\mathbf{h}_j\}$-sector can be given in terms of fusion trees of topological charge lines passing through the interior of the surface, as shown in Fig. 15. Using the choice where the $\mathbf{h}_j$-branch lines loop around their cycles unchanged, we may have a charge line $a_j \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}_j}$ that winds around the complementary cycle of the $j$th handle and transforms into ${}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}_j}a_j$ when




FIG. 15: The twisted sectors on a genus $g$ surface can be labeled by $2g$ group elements $\{\mathbf{g}_j,\mathbf{h}_j\}$ for $j = 1,\ldots,g$, which are ascribed to the defect branch lines around two independent non-contractible cycles associated with the $j$th handle. In this case, one does not require that $\mathbf{g}_j$ and $\mathbf{h}_j$ commute, so one of the branch lines at a given handle may change as it crosses the complementary branch line at that handle. We pick the $\mathbf{h}_j$-branch lines to close around their cycles unchanged, while the $\mathbf{g}_j$ branch lines transform into $\mathbf{h}_j^{-1}\mathbf{g}_j\mathbf{h}_j$ branch lines when they cross the $\mathbf{h}_j$-branch. This requires a $\mathbf{k}_j$-branch line, where $\mathbf{k}_j = \mathbf{g}_j\mathbf{h}_j^{-1}\mathbf{g}_j^{-1}\mathbf{h}_j$, to enter the handle to cancel the leftover branch. Similarly, the $a_j \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}_j}$ charge lines used to define basis state may also transform nontrivially as ${}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}_j}a_j$ when it crosses the $\mathbf{h}_j$-branch loop. This requires a line of charge $z_j \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{k}_j}$ with $N^{z_j}_{a_j\, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_j \overline{a_j}} \neq 0$ to enter the handle to cancel the leftover topological charge. The $z_j$ charge lines from different handles form a fusion tree. These charge line configurations, together with the fusion vertex state labels, provide a basis of states for the genus $g$ surface in the $\{\mathbf{g}_j,\mathbf{h}_j\}$-sector.

it crosses the $\mathbf{h}_j$-branch loop. In closing back on itself, this topological charge loop must fuse with a possibly nontrivial line of charge $z_j \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{k}_j}$ such that $N_{a_j\ \bar{\mathbf{h}}_j \overline{a_j}}^{z_j} \neq 0$. The charge $z_j$ lines from the different handles then form a fusion tree that must terminate in the trivial topological charge.

In particular, the basis states described in this way can be written as

$$\bigotimes_{j=1}^{g} |a_j,\ {}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}_j}\overline{a_j}; z_j, \mu_j\rangle |c_{1\ldots j-1}, z_j; c_{1\ldots j}, \nu_{1\ldots j}\rangle, \tag{377}$$

for all possible values (allowed by fusion) of topological charges $a_j \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}_j}$, $z_j \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{k}_j}$, and $c_{1\ldots j} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{l}_j}$ for $\mathbf{l}_j = \prod_{i=1}^{j} \mathbf{k}_i$, and fusion vertex basis labels $\mu_j = 1, \ldots, N_{a_j\ \bar{\mathbf{h}}_j \overline{a_j}}^{z_j}$, and $\nu_{1\ldots j} = 1, \ldots, N_{c_{1\ldots j-1} z_j}^{c_{1\ldots j}}$. We set $c_\emptyset = c_{1\ldots g} = 0$ (which gives $c_1 = z_1$) and $\mathbf{l}_g = \mathbf{0}$, in order to let $j = 1, \ldots, g$ for all these quantities.

We note that the states in Eq. (377) may transform nontrivially under the symmetry action of $\mathbf{q} \in G$. In particular,

$$\rho_{\mathbf{q}} : \mathcal{V}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}} \ \rightarrow\ V_{\{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{g}_j\mathbf{q}^{-1}, \mathbf{q}\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{q}^{-1}\}} \tag{378}$$

$$|\psi\rangle \ \mapsto\ \rho_{\mathbf{q}}(|\psi\rangle) \tag{379}$$

This symmetry action will play a crucial role when $G$ is promoted to a local gauge invariance.

In order to obtain the number of ground states in the $\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}$-sector

$$\mathcal{N}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}} = \dim \mathcal{V}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}}, \tag{380}$$

we can sum over the fusion channels

$$\mathcal{N}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}} = \sum_{\substack{a_j \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}_j} \\ z_j \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{k}_j}}} N_{z_1 z_2 \cdots z_g}^{0} \prod_{j=1}^{g} N_{a_j\ \bar{\mathbf{h}}_j \overline{a_j}}^{z_j}, \tag{381}$$

where

$$N_{z_1 z_2 \cdots z_g}^{0} = \sum_{c_{1\ldots j} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{l}_j}} N_{z_1 z_2}^{c_{12}} N_{c_{12} z_3}^{c_{123}} \cdots N_{c_{1\ldots g-1} z_g}^{0} \tag{382}$$

is the number of ways the topological charges $z_1, \ldots, z_g$ can fuse to $0$. We can evaluate these expressions using the $G$-crossed Verlinde formula Eq. (332), together with $G$-graded modularity and other properties that we derived for the $S$-matrix in Sec. VI D, which yields

$$\mathcal{N}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}^{2g-2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}^{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}}} d_x^{-(2g-2)} \times \prod_{j=1}^{g} \frac{\eta_x(\bar{\mathbf{h}}_j, \bar{\mathbf{g}}_j)\eta_x(\mathbf{g}_j, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_j\bar{\mathbf{g}}_j\mathbf{h}_j)}{\eta_x(\mathbf{g}_j, \bar{\mathbf{g}}_j)\eta_x(\bar{\mathbf{h}}_j\bar{\mathbf{g}}_j\mathbf{h}_j, \bar{\mathbf{h}}_j)} \eta_x(\mathbf{l}_{j-1}, \mathbf{k}_j), \tag{383}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}^{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}}$ is the set of all topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ that are $\mathbf{g}_j$-invariant and $\mathbf{h}_j$-invariant for all $j = 1, \ldots, g$. When $\mathbf{h}_j = \mathbf{0}$ for all $j$, this expression simplifies to

$$\mathcal{N}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j = 0\}} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}^{2g-2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}^{\{\mathbf{g}_j\}}} d_x^{-(2g-2)}, \tag{384}$$




FIG. 16: When $G = \mathbb{Z}_p$ for $p$ prime, any twisted sector can be mapped via Dehn twists to the sector with a single twist corresponding to a element $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, which generates the group. Thus, all $\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}$-sectors that are not completely trivial must have the same ground state degeneracy.

which clearly satisfies $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}^{2g-2} \leq \mathcal{N}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j = \mathbf{0}\}} \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}^{2g}$. From Eq. (383), we see that, in general, the genus $g$ degeneracy $\mathcal{N}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}} \leq \mathcal{N}_{\{\mathbf{0}_j, \mathbf{0}_j\}}$, and generally scales as $\mathcal{N}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}} \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}^{2g}$ in the large $g$ limit, regardless of the twisted sector. This provides a physical interpretation of the total quantum dimension $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{g}}$ of each $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ subsector.

We note that another physical interpretation of the total quantum dimension $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}$ is given by the topological entanglement entropy [134, 135]. One can use the properties of $G$-crossed modularity to compute the topological entanglement entropy of a region, following the arguments of Ref. [134]. Unsurprisingly, this yields the same result as for MTCs that $S_{\text{topo}} = -n \log \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}$, where $n$ is the number of connected components of the boundary of the region in question, regardless of the number of branch lines passing through the region. There are also anyonic contributions $S_a = \log d_a$ to the entanglement entropy when there are quasiparticles or $\mathbf{g}$-defects within the region whose collective topological charge is $a$ (see also Ref. [18]).

### 1. *Dehn twists on high genus surfaces*

Another powerful method of computing $\mathcal{N}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}}$ on a genus $g$ surface is to make use of modular transformations. Similar to the case of the torus, we can define operators using the data of a $G$-crossed UMTC $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, that provide a projective representation of the modular transformations of the genus $g$ surface. We will not go into these details here, but, instead, will simply utilize the property that the modular transformations can be used to interchange, combine, and twist the various non-contractible cycles of the surface, as we saw for the torus. Unitarity of the modular transformations implies that when two different twisted sectors $\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}$ and $\{\mathbf{g}'_j, \mathbf{h}'_j\}$ can be related by such modular transformations, they must have the same ground state degeneracy.

As a simple example, let us consider $G = \mathbb{Z}_p$ and take $\mathbf{g}$ to be a generator of this group. When $p$ is prime, any element $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ generates the group. In this case, every nontrivial $\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}$-sector can be related by Dehn twists to the sector with only a single $\mathbf{h}$-defect branch line wrapped around a single cycle (see Fig. 16). The proof of this statement, and some generalizations, is given below.

Specifically, in the following we show that for a genus $g$ surface, when $G = \mathbb{Z}_N$, the $(N^{2g} - 1)$ non-trivial twisted sectors can all be obtained by Dehn twists from a small "gen-




FIG. 17: Non-contractible cocycles on a $g = 3$ surface.

erating" set of generating sectors (the case $N = 2$ was proven in [102]). We start by examining a torus ($g = 1$). Since we are considering a cyclic group, group multiplication will be denoted additively. We label the twisted sector by $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}) = (m, n)$ where $m, n = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1$. There are $N^2 - 1$ nontrivial sectors in total.

An arbitrary modular transformation acts on a twisted sector $(m, n)$ by a $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} m \\ n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} am + bn \\ cm + dn \end{pmatrix}. \tag{385}$$

Here $ad - bc = 1, a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$. Letting $r = \gcd(m, n)$, we now show that $(m, n)$ can be obtained from $(r, 0)$ by a modular transformation. To see this, we set $a = \frac{m}{r}, c = \frac{n}{r}$ in the $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ matrix. We then need to find $b, d$ such that $\frac{m}{r}d - \frac{n}{r}b = 1$. Since $\gcd\left(\frac{m}{r}, \frac{n}{r}\right) = 1$, this equation has integral solutions.

Next, we show that for arbitrary $m$, $(m, 0)$ can be obtained from $(s, 0)$ where $s = \gcd(m, N)$. From Eq. Eq. (385), we see that we need to find an $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ matrix with $a = \frac{m}{s}$ and $c = \frac{N}{s}$. We need to find integers $b, d$ such that $ad - bc = \frac{m}{s}d - \frac{N}{s}b = 1$, which is solvable since $\gcd(m, N) = s$. Therefore we have established that *the twist sectors $(r, 0)$, where $r$ is a divisor of $N$, is a generating set.* That is, the number of generating twist sectors is equal to the number of divisors of $N$.

We now consider a genus $g$ surface. A similar reduction of a general twisted sector to a small number of generating twisted sectors is also possible. The inequivalent cycles associated with each handle are labeled by $A_i, B_i$ where $i = 1, \ldots, g$ (see Fig. 17). The twisted sectors are now labeled by $2g$ integers (mod $N$) $\{(m_1, n_1), \ldots, (m_g, n_g)\}$. We note that applying a Dehn twist along $C_1$ has the following effect:

$$\begin{aligned} &A_1 \to A_1 \\ &B_1 \to B_1 + C_1 = B_1 - A_1 + A_2 \\ &A_2 \to A_2 \\ &B_2 \to B_2 - A_1 + A_2. \end{aligned} \tag{386}$$

The configuration then becomes $\{(m_1, n_1 - m_1 + m_2), (m_2, n_2 - m_1 + m_2), \ldots\}$.

The arguments from the genus $g = 1$ case above imply that by applying Dehn twists along $A_i$ or $B_i$, we can always map any general twisted sector to the form $\{(m_1, 0), (m_2, 0), \ldots, (m_g, 0)\}$. If at least one of the $m_i$'s is coprime with $N$, we can further perform Dehn twists to reduce the configuration to a twist along a single cycle. To see this, let us assume $\gcd(m_1, N) = 1$. We can do an S transformation to map to the configuration $\{(m_1, 0), (0, m_2), \ldots\}$. After applying $k$ Dehn twists along $-C_1$, we get $\{(m_1, km_1), (0, m_2 + km_1), \ldots\}$. Since $\gcd(m_1, N) = 1$, there exists a $k$ such that $m_2 + km_1 \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, N)$, resulting in the sector $\{(m_1, km_1), (0, 0), \ldots\}$. This can be further reduced to $\{(m_1, 0), (0, 0), \ldots\}$ by Dehn twists. A similar argument can be applied in the case when $m_1 = m_2 = \cdots = m_g$, without the need to assume $\gcd(m_i, N) = 1$.

In particular, the above arguments imply that when $N$ is prime, then the general twisted sector can always be mapped to a sector with a single elementary twist along only one cycle of the genus $g$ surface.

## VIII. GAUGING THE SYMMETRY

We have, so far, studied the properties of the defects, which correspond to extrinsically imposed (confined) fluxes of the symmetry group $G$, as described by a $G$-crossed theory $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$. In this section, we consider the nature of the resulting phase when the global symmetry $G$ is promoted to a local gauge invariance – "gauging the symmetry." This is also referred to as "equivariantization" in the mathematical literature. A physical consequence of our investigation is that the confined g-defects become deconfined quasiparticle excitations of the gauged phase. We would like to understand how to obtain the properties and basic data of the gauged theory, which is denoted as $\mathcal{C}/G$, from the $G$-crossed extension $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ of the UMTC $\mathcal{C}$ describing the original topological phase. We will see that, given the complete data of the $G$-crossed UMTC $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, we can obtain the quasiparticle content, fusion rules, and modular data of the corresponding UMTC $\mathcal{C}/G$.

On the other hand, we can consider the inverse of this construction. Starting from the gauged theory $\mathcal{C}/G$, we can tune the interactions so that the "charged" matter, which transforms under irreducible representations of $G$, condenses, and the gauge theory undergoes a continuous confinement-deconfinement transition into the Higgs phase. The resulting topological order can be analyzed using the theory of topological Bose condensation [75], where the subcategory consisting of gauge charges of $G$ (referred to as $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$) condenses. In short, all gauge fluxes in $\mathcal{C}/G$ become confined, while the deconfined remnants give rise to $\mathcal{C}$. The algebraic theory of topological defects that we have developed in this paper provides a complete description, in particular providing the braiding and modular transformations, of the sectors that are confined in the condensation of $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$, which is called the $\mathcal{T}$-theory in Ref. [75].

We summarize the relation between $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, and $\mathcal{C}/G$ by the following diagram:

$$\mathcal{C} \underset{\text{Confinement}}{\overset{\text{Defectification}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathcal{C}_G^\times \underset{\text{Condensation}}{\overset{\text{Gauging}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathcal{C}/G$$

In this section, we consider only finite symmetry groups

$G$. We will first examine the problem of how to modify a microscopic Hamiltonian that realizes a topological phase $\mathcal{C}$ and has an on-site symmetry $G$ in a manner that gauges the symmetry and realizes the topological phase $\mathcal{C}/G$. Then we will study how to derive the mathematical properties of the gauged phase's UMTC $\mathcal{C}/G$ from the corresponding $G$-crossed UMTC $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$.

### A. Microscopic Models

Gauging a symmetry of a microscopic Hamiltonian is a well-known notion in physics. However, a gauge theory does not, in general, have a local Hilbert space. Suppose we are given a $G$-symmetric microscopic Hamiltonian $H$ that (1) is defined on a Hilbert space that decomposes into a tensor product of local Hilbert spaces on each site, (2) has local interactions, and (3) realizes a topological phase $\mathcal{C}$ at long-wavelengths. Here, we address the question of whether or not we can produce a new Hamiltonian $H_G$ that also satisfies (1) and (2) above, but realizes $\mathcal{C}/G$ at long-wavelengths.

We will briefly describe the case where $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$. Suppose that the Hamiltonian consists of nearest neighbor interactions on a two-dimensional lattice. We assume that there is a finite-dimensional bosonic Hilbert space at each site of the lattice, and there is a global on-site $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry with $R_{\mathbf{g}} = \prod_j R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}$. Such a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetric Hamiltonian can generically be written as

$$H = \sum_{\langle ij\rangle} J_{+,ij}^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{O}_i^{+,\alpha}\mathcal{O}_j^{+,\beta} + J_{-,ij}^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{O}_i^{-,\alpha}\mathcal{O}_j^{-,\beta} + \sum_i m_i^\alpha \mathcal{O}_i^{+,\alpha} + \text{H.c.}, \tag{387}$$

where $\{\mathcal{O}_j^{\pm,\alpha}\}$ are a complete set of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ even/odd local operators at site $j$. In particular, these operators satisfy $R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)}\mathcal{O}_j^\pm R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(j)-1} = \pm\mathcal{O}_j^\pm$.

Now, let us introduce a two-dimensional Hilbert space on each bond $\langle ij\rangle$ of the lattice. The gauged Hamiltonian is defined as

$$H_{\mathbb{Z}_2} = \sum_{\langle ij\rangle} J_{+,ij}^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{O}_i^{+,\alpha}\mathcal{O}_j^{+,\beta} + \sum_i m_i^\alpha \mathcal{O}_i^{+,\alpha} + \sum_{\langle ij\rangle} J_{-,ij}^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{O}_i^{-,\alpha}\mathcal{O}_j^{-,\beta}\sigma_{ij}^z + \text{H.c.} - K\sum_\square \prod_{\langle ij\rangle\in\square}\sigma_{ij}^z - \Gamma\sum_{\langle ij\rangle}\sigma_{ij}^x - U\sum_+ R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(i)}\prod_{\langle ij\rangle\in+}\sigma_{ij}^x. \tag{388}$$

We always assume that $U$ is the largest energy scale, which effectively imposes a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ analog of Gauss's law in the low-energy Hilbert space: $\prod_{\langle ij\rangle\in+}\sigma_{ij}^x = R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(i)}$. It is straightforward to extend the construction to Hamiltonians involving longer-range interactions.

We notice that the full gauged Hamiltonian (not just the low-energy subspace) still preserves the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry $R_{\mathbf{g}}$. In the low-energy subspace $U \to \infty$ where the dynamics can be described by a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ gauge theory with matter, the global symmetry is enhanced to a local gauge symmetry generated by precisely the local conserved quantity $R_{\mathbf{g}}^{(i)}\prod_{\langle ij\rangle\in+}\sigma_{ij}^x$. The gauged Hamiltonian has the feature that when $\Gamma = 0$ and $K, U$ are both much larger than any energy scale in $H$, the low-energy spectrum without any $\mathbb{Z}_2$ fluxes is identical to that of $H$. However, the states must be projected to the gauge-invariant Hilbert space.

We now review the phase diagram of the gauge theory [136], focusing on the three parameters $J_-, K$ and $\Gamma$. Three limiting cases can be easily identified. When $J_-, \Gamma \ll K$, the gauge field is in the deconfined phase. When $J_- \gg K, \Gamma$, the gauge theory is in the Higgs phase and the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ fluxes (i.e. visons) are linearly confined. If $\Gamma$ is dominant, $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charges are linearly confined. It is however well-known that the Higgs and the confinement phases are smoothly connected. Hence there are only two phases which are separated by a second-order phase transition belonging to the 3D Ising universality class.

The above construction can straightforwardly be generalized to the case $G = \mathbb{Z}_N$. The generalization to a general finite group $G$ is technically more involved and will be left for future work.

### B. Topological Charges and Fusion Rules of $\mathcal{C}/G$

We now turn to the derivation of the topological properties of the gauged theory. The simplest information about the gauged theory $\mathcal{C}/G$ that we can read off from $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ is the topological charge content. The mathematical description of this was provided in Ref. [83].

For each topological charge (simple object) $a \in \mathcal{C}_G^\times$ of the $G$-crossed theory, we define its orbit under $G$ to be the set of charges

$$[a] = \{{}^{\mathbf{g}}a, \forall \mathbf{g} \in G\}. \tag{389}$$

Heuristically, the reason for considering $G$ orbits is that, under the $G$ action, all topological charges within an orbit must combine into a single object by "quantum superposition" once the global symmetry is promoted to a local gauge invariance. In this way, the original topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ become internal degrees of freedom. In particular, if we ignore the topological charge labels within each $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ and only focus on the group elements, the orbit would simply be a conjugacy class of $G$, which is what labels gauge fluxes in a discrete gauge theory. Keeping track of the topological charge labels, it is clear that there can be multiple orbits associated with a given conjugacy class of $G$.

Additionally, we need to take into account the different representations of the symmetry, which thus allows us to include the gauge charges and flux-charge composites. For this, we do not consider the full symmetry group $G$, but rather the subgroups that keep the relevant topological charge labels invariant. More precisely, for a given $[a]$, we choose a representative element $a \in [a]$, and define its stabilizer subgroup

$$G_a = \{\, \mathbf{g} \in G \,|\, {}^{\mathbf{g}}a = a \,\}. \tag{390}$$

The topological charges of $\mathcal{C}/G$ are then defined to be the pairs

$$([a], \pi_a), \tag{391}$$

where $\pi_a$ is an irreducible projective representation of $G_a$ with the factor set given by $\eta_a$, i.e.

$$\pi_a(\mathbf{g})\pi_a(\mathbf{h}) = \eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\pi_a(\mathbf{gh}), \quad \mathbf{g},\mathbf{h} \in G_a. \tag{392}$$

We will refer to such an irreducible projective $\eta_a$-representation as an $\eta_a$-irrep. The phases $\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ here are precisely the projective symmetry fractionalization phases of the $G$-crossed theory, defined in Sec. VI. Thus, we see that the data $\eta_a$ are essential in defining the quasiparticles of the gauged theory.

In order for this definition of topological charge to be well-defined, the specific choice of $a$ within the conjugacy class $[a]$ should not lead to essential differences in the corresponding projective representations. To make this notion more precise, we first notice that conjugation by $\mathbf{k} \in G$ provides a canonical isomorphism between $G_a$ and $G_{\mathbf{k}a}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{k} : G_a &\to G_{\mathbf{k}a} \\ \mathbf{g} &\mapsto {}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g}. \end{aligned} \tag{393}$$

Next, from Eq. (265), we see that, for group elements $\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h} \in G_a$, we have the cocycle condition

$$\frac{\eta_a(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\,\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})}{\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\,\eta_a(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})} = 1, \tag{394}$$

so $\eta_a \in Z^2(G_a, \mathrm{U}(1))$. From Eq. (269), we see that, for $\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h} \in G_a$, we have the relation

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\mathbf{k}a}({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{h}) &= \frac{\eta_a(\bar{\mathbf{k}},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{h})}{\eta_a(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}\frac{\eta_a(\mathbf{gh},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}{\eta_a(\bar{\mathbf{k}},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g}{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{h})}\frac{\eta_a(\bar{\mathbf{k}},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g})}{\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \\ &= \mathrm{d}\varepsilon_{a,\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}), \end{aligned} \tag{395}$$

where we have defined the 1-cochain $\varepsilon_{a,\mathbf{k}} \in C^1(G_a, \mathrm{U}(1))$ to be $\varepsilon_{a,\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{g}) = \frac{\eta_a(\bar{\mathbf{k}},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g})}{\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}$. Thus, when viewed in terms of cohomology, we see that the $\mathbf{k}$-action does not change the cohomology class of $\eta_a$, i.e.

$$[\eta_{\mathbf{k}a}({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{h})] = [\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})] \in H^2(G_a, \mathrm{U}(1)). \tag{396}$$

Moreover, it is clear that we then also have

$$[\eta_{\mathbf{k}a}({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{h})] = [\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})] \in H^2(G_{\mathbf{k}a}, \mathrm{U}(1)). \tag{397}$$

As discussed in Appendix B, this implies that there is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between the set of $\eta_a$-irreps of $G_a$ and the set of $\eta_{\mathbf{k}a}$-irreps of $G_{\mathbf{k}a}$. We will write

$${}^{\mathbf{k}}\pi_a({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g}) = \varepsilon_{a,\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{g})\,\pi_a(\mathbf{g}) \tag{398}$$

to denote the $\eta_{\mathbf{k}a}$-irrep of $G_{\mathbf{k}a}$ which is canonically isomorphic to the $\eta_a$-irrep $\pi_a$ of $G_a$ under this mapping.

In this way, the topological charges of $\mathcal{C}/G$ are essentially "flux-charge" composites, very much like the dyonic excitations in discrete gauge theories, but which also take into account the possibility of having distinct types of $\mathbf{g}$-flux defects, corresponding to distinct topological charge values $a \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$.

With this definition of the topological charges of $\mathcal{C}/G$, it is straightforward to determine the corresponding quantum dimensions. In particular, we just sum over the quantum dimensions of all the charges in the orbit and multiply by the dimension of the attached $\eta_a$-irrep, so that $([a],\pi_a)$ has quantum dimension given by

$$d_{([a],\pi_a)} = d_a \cdot \big|[a]\big| \cdot \dim(\pi_a), \tag{399}$$

where $d_a$ is the quantum dimension of $a$ (which is the same for all $a \in [a]$), $\big|[a]\big|$ the number of elements in the orbit $[a]$, and $\dim(\pi_a)$ the dimension of the $\eta_a$-irrep $\pi_a$.

Having specified the topological charges of $\mathcal{C}/G$ and their quantum dimensions, it is straightforward to prove that the total quantum dimension is

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}/G} = |G|^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}_G} = |G|\mathcal{D}_0. \tag{400}$$

For this, we first consider the different $\eta_a$-irreps of the stabilizer subgroup $G_a$ of $a$ in a given orbit $[a]$. It is known that $\sum_{\pi_a} |\dim(\pi_a)|^2 = |G_a|$ for such $\eta_a$-irreps, as shown in Appendix B. With this, and the fact that $\big|[a]\big||G_a| = |G|$, we obtain the result

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^2_{\mathcal{C}/G} &= \sum_{([a],\pi_a)\in\mathcal{C}/G} d^2_{([a],\pi_a)} \\ &= \sum_{([a],\pi_a)} d_a^2\big|[a]\big|^2|\dim(\pi_a)|^2 = \sum_{[a]} d_a^2\big|[a]\big|^2|G_a| \\ &= |G|\sum_{[a]} d_a^2\big|[a]\big| = |G|\sum_{a\in\mathcal{C}_G^\times} d_a^2 \\ &= |G|\mathcal{D}^2_{\mathcal{C}_G} = |G|^2\mathcal{D}^2_{\mathcal{C}_0}. \end{aligned} \tag{401}$$

The fusion rules for the topological charges of $\mathcal{C}/G$ have also been recently described in the mathematical literature [83]. To obtain these, we need to understand both how to fuse two $G$-orbits and how to fuse two $\eta_a$-irreps. For pedagogical reasons, we will give a heuristic discussion to justify the fusion rules of $\mathcal{C}/G$ before presenting the actual expression.

We first consider a very coarse version of the problem. In particular, we suppress the topological charge label associated with an orbit and multiply two conjugacy classes $C_1$ and $C_2$ of $G$. For this, we first form the product set

$$\{\mathbf{g}_1\mathbf{g}_2 \,|\, \mathbf{g}_1 \in C_1, \mathbf{g}_2 \in C_2\},$$

which can be equivalently expressed using representative elements $\mathbf{g}_1 \in C_1$ and $\mathbf{g}_2 \in C_2$ as

$$\{\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}_1\mathbf{h}^{-1}\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}_2\mathbf{k}^{-1} \,|\, \mathbf{h} \in G/N_{\mathbf{g}_1}, \mathbf{k} \in G/N_{\mathbf{g}_2}\},$$

where

$$N_{\mathbf{g}} = \{\mathbf{h} \in G \,|\, \mathbf{gh} = \mathbf{hg}\}, \tag{402}$$

denotes the centralizer of $\mathbf{g}$ in $G$. Now the problem is to decompose the product set into conjugacy classes. To this end, we observe that if $\mathbf{h}' = \mathbf{lh}$ and $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{lk}$, then $\mathbf{h}'\mathbf{g}_1\mathbf{h}'^{-1}\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{g}_2'\mathbf{k}'^{-1} = \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{h}\mathbf{g}_1\mathbf{h}^{-1}\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}_2\mathbf{k}^{-1})\mathbf{l}^{-1}$, i.e. the two elements are in the same coset. Hence, we are naturally led to conclude that the conjugacy classes contained in the product set are given by the coset of diagonal left multiplication on $G/N_{\mathbf{g}_1} \times G/N_{\mathbf{g}_2}$, which is the double coset $N_{\mathbf{g}_1}\backslash G/N_{\mathbf{g}_2}$.

We now return to the problem of the fusion of two orbits $[a]$ and $[b]$, neglecting for the moment the $\eta_a$-irreps attached to them. Selecting representative elements $a \in [a]$ and $b \in [b]$, the fusion of the two orbits give a direct sum of all the elements in the set

$$\{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a) \times \rho_{\mathbf{h}}(b) \,|\, \mathbf{g} \in G/G_a, \mathbf{h} \in G/G_b\},$$

where we take the coset over $G_a$ and $G_b$ here, since these subgroups do not modify the corresponding labels. We now need to decompose this set further into $G$-orbits. For this, we have the similar property that if $\mathbf{g}' = \mathbf{kg}$ and $\mathbf{h}' = \mathbf{kg}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\mathbf{g}'}(a) \times \rho_{\mathbf{h}'}(b) &= \rho_{\mathbf{k}}\big(\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a)\big) \times \rho_{\mathbf{k}}\big(\rho_{\mathbf{h}}(b)\big) \\ &= \rho_{\mathbf{k}}\big(\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a) \times \rho_{\mathbf{h}}(b)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{403}$$

This essentially says that the fusion channels of $\rho_{\mathbf{g}'}(a) \times \rho_{\mathbf{h}'}(b)$ are exactly the image of those of $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a) \times \rho_{\mathbf{h}}(b)$ under the action of $\mathbf{k}$. Therefore, fusion of orbits correspond to the equivalence classes of $G/G_a \times G/G_b$ under diagonal left (or right) multiplication, which is known to be isomorphic to the double coset $G_a\backslash G/G_b$.

Next, we consider how the $\eta_a$-irreps attached to the defects should be combined. Naïvely, one would expect that we just take the tensor product of the representations and decompose it as a direct sum of irreps. However, an important subtlety in this case is that the fusion/splitting spaces of the defects can transform nontrivially under the symmetry group action, and this should also be taken into account in the fusion. More explicitly, we consider the fusion/splitting vertex state spaces $V_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}^{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}$ and $V_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}$, and we define the stablizer subgroup for this space as $H_{(a,b;c)} = G_a \cap G_b \cap G_c$. The symmetry action (sliding moves) consistency Eq. (259) tells us that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\lambda,\delta} [U_{\mathbf{l}}(a,b;c)]_{\mu\lambda} [U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,b;c)]_{\lambda\nu} \\ = \frac{\eta_c(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})}{\eta_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})\eta_b(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})} [U_{\mathbf{kl}}(a,b;c)]_{\mu\nu} \end{aligned} \tag{404}$$

for $\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l} \in H_{(a,b;c)}$. We notice that the $U$ transformations can be thought of as being associated with the action on the splitting spaces $V_c^{ab}$, while the transpose $U^{\mathrm{T}}$ corresponds to the action on the fusion spaces $V_{ab}^c$, as seen in Eqs. (255) and (256). The symmetry action consistency implies that $U^{\mathrm{T}}$ form a projective representation of $H_{(a,b;c)}$, with a factor set given by

$$\kappa_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}(a,b;c)^{-1} = \frac{\eta_c(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})}{\eta_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})\eta_b(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})} \tag{405}$$

restricted to $\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l} \in H_{(a,b;c)}$. We will denote this projective representation of $H_{(a,b;c)}$ by $U^{\mathrm{T}}$ as $\pi_{(a,b;c)}$ and its character is given by

$$\chi_{\pi_{(a,b;c)}}(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mu} \big[U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,b;c)\big]_{\mu\mu}. \tag{406}$$

With the above discussion as justification, we present the formula for the fusion coefficients of the $\mathcal{C}/G$ MTC [83]

$$N_{([a],\pi_a)([b],\pi_b)}^{([c],\pi_c)} = \sum_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}) \in G_a\backslash G/G_b} m\left(\pi_c\big|_{H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}}, {}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a\big|_{H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}} \otimes {}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b\big|_{H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}} \otimes \pi_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}\right), \tag{407}$$

where $H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)} = G_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a} \cap G_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}b} \cap G_c$ and the notation $\pi\big|_{H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}}$ means the restriction of the irrep $\pi$ to the subgroup $H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}$. As we discussed above, the tensor product ${}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a\big|_{H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}} \otimes {}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b\big|_{H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}} \otimes \pi_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}$ has the factor set given by

$$\eta_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})\eta_b(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})\kappa_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}}(a,b;c)^{-1} = \eta_c(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}) \tag{408}$$

for $\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l} \in H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}$, which is precisely the same factor set as $\pi_c\big|_{H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}}$. We note that the restriction of an irrep to a subgroup is not necessarily an irrep of the subgroup. Finally, $m(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a sort of integer-valued inner product that, in some sense, measures the multiplicity of the entries with respect to each other. If one of the entries is an irrep, then this multiplicity function simply counts the number of times this irrep occurs in the other entry's irrep decomposition. However, the general description of the multiplicity function is more complicated than the statement that it counts the number of times one entry occurs in the other. The precise definition of this multiplicity function $m$ is given in Appendix B. For practical purposes, it may be computed in terms of the projective characters of the projective representations, as in Eq. (B8).

The formula in Eq. (407) may appear obtuse without some experience in using it for concrete computations. For this, we refer the reader to Sec. X, where this formula is utilized to derive the fusion rules of the gauged theory for several examples.

As the first application of this formula, we determine the topological charge conjugate (antiparticle) of $([a],\pi_a)$. It should be clear that if $([b],\pi_b)$ is the charge conjugate

$([a],\pi_a)$, then $[b]=[\bar{a}]$, since, for each $a\in[a]$, there must be an element $b\in[b]$ such that $N_{ab}^0\neq 0$. Regarding the $\eta_{\bar{a}}$-irrep of the conjugate charge, a natural guess would be the conjugate irrep $\pi_a^*$, since $\pi_a\otimes\pi_a^*=\mathbb{1}\oplus\cdots$. However, the factor set of $\pi_a^*$ is $\eta_a^*$, which is in general only gauge-equivalent to $\eta_{\bar{a}}$. In fact, from the symmetry action consistency Eq. (259), we have the relation

$$\eta_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})\eta_{\overline{a}}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})=\frac{U_{\mathbf{kl}}(a,\overline{a};0)}{U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,\overline{a};0)U_{\mathbf{l}}(a,\overline{a};0)}, \tag{409}$$

for $\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}\in G_a$. It follows that we should define the charge conjugate's irrep to be

$$\overline{\pi}_a(\mathbf{k})=U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,\bar{a};0)^{-1}\pi_a^*(\mathbf{k}). \tag{410}$$

This is, indeed, an $\eta_{\bar{a}}$-irrep of $G_{\bar{a}}$, i.e. it has the factor set $\eta_{\bar{a}}$. Thus, the topological charge conjugate of $([a],\pi_a)\in\mathcal{C}/G$ is

$$\overline{([a],\pi_a)}=([\bar{a}],\overline{\pi}_a) \tag{411}$$

with $\bar{a}$ the charge conjugate of $a\in\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ and $\overline{\pi}_a$ the $\eta_{\bar{a}}$-irrep of $G_{\bar{a}}$ defined in Eq. (410). We can verify this by plugging $([a],\pi_a)$ and $\overline{([a],\pi_a)}$ into Eq. (407), where we would find that the tensor product in the second entry of $m$ simply becomes $\pi_a\otimes\pi_a^*$ which contains the trivial representation $\mathbb{1}$ precisely once.

### C. Modular Data of the Gauged Theory

The basic data of a MTC can be conveniently organized into the modular $S$ and $T$ matrices or, equivalently, the fusion multiplicities, quantum dimensions, and topological twists of the topological charges. In fact, it is a widely believed conjecture that this topological data uniquely characterizes the MTC describing a topological phase, i.e. that it uniquely specifies the $F$-symbols and $R$-symbols, up to gauge equivalence. As such, we will simply focus on these quantities here.

First, we want to find the topological twists of the topological charges in $\mathcal{C}/G$. As we have discussed above, a topological charge in $\mathcal{C}/G$ has the form of a generalized "flux-charge" composite, the "flux" being a $G$-orbit of defects and the "charge" being a projective $\eta$-irrep. Thus, we expect that the topological twist of such objects will receive a contribution from the defect's twist (carrying over from the $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ theory), as well as an Aharonov-Bohm type phase from the (internal) braiding of the object's flux and charge around each other. The latter contribution is roughly given by the character of the projective irreps, as it is in discrete gauge theories. Therefore, we conjecture the following formula for the topological twists of topological charges in $\mathcal{C}/G$

$$\theta_{([a],\pi_a)}=\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}\frac{\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g})}{\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{0})}. \tag{412}$$

In this expression, $\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}$ is the topological twist of $a_{\mathbf{g}}\in\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ and

$$\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g})=\mathrm{Tr}\left[\pi_a(\mathbf{g})\right] \tag{413}$$

is the projective character of the $\eta_a$-irrep $\pi_a$ (see Appendix B). $\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{0})=\dim(\pi_a)$ is equal to the dimension of $\pi_a$.

It is straightforward to see that this expression for $\theta_{([a],\pi_a)}$ is indeed equal to a phase. Specifically, since $\eta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})=\eta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{g})$ for all $\mathbf{h}\in G_a$, it follows that $\pi_a(\mathbf{g})\pi_a(\mathbf{h})=\pi_a(\mathbf{h})\pi_a(\mathbf{g})$. Using Schur's lemma, we deduce that $\pi_a(\mathbf{g})\propto\mathbb{1}$. Since the representations are unitary, it follows that $\frac{\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g})}{\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{0})}$ is a $\mathrm{U}(1)$ phase.

We stress that the projective character depends on the particular factor set $\eta_a$, not just the equivalence class to which it belongs. While neither $\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}$ nor $\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g})$ is individually invariant under the symmetry action gauge transformations, their product actually is invariant under such gauge transformations. More explicitly, under a symmetry action gauge transformation, as in Eq. (280), the projective character transforms as

$$\check{\chi}_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g})=\gamma_a^{-1}(\mathbf{g})\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g}) \tag{414}$$

and $\check{\theta}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}=\gamma_a(\mathbf{g})\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}$. Thus,

$$\check{\chi}_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g})\check{\theta}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}=\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g})\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}. \tag{415}$$

We also notice that vertex basis transformations leave both $\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}$ and $\chi_{\pi_a}$, and hence $\theta_{([a],\pi_a)}$ invariant.

We must also check that $\theta_{([a_{\mathbf{g}}],\pi_a)}$ does not depend upon the choice of $a_{\mathbf{g}}\in[a]$. Consider a different representative element ${}^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}$ with $\mathbf{k}\in G/G_a$. In Eq. (286), we saw that

$$\theta_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}=\frac{\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}{\eta_a(\bar{\mathbf{k}},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g})}\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}. \tag{416}$$

As shown in the previous subsection, there is a canonical correspondence between the projective representations of $G_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a}$ and $G_a$. Thus, we choose the projective representation for ${}^{\mathbf{k}}a$ to be ${}^{\mathbf{k}}\pi_a$. According to Eq. (398), we have

$$\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g})=\frac{\eta_a(\bar{\mathbf{k}},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g})}{\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g}). \tag{417}$$

This results in the relation

$$\theta_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g})=\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g}), \tag{418}$$

which demonstrates that the expression for the topological twist is indeed independent of the choice of $a\in[a]$.

As a special case, we notice that if $[a]\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$, then $\theta_{[a]}=\theta_a$, which is expected from the theory of topological Bose condensation.

Given our formula in Eq. (412) for the topological twists of $\mathcal{C}/G$, we now prove that the chiral central charge $c_-$ (mod 8) of the gauged theory is the same as that of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$. To see this, we first evaluate the Gauss sum for a specific $G$-orbit $[a]$, summing over $\eta_a$-irreps

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\pi_a}d^2_{([a],\pi_a)}\theta_{([a],\pi_a)}&=\sum_{\pi_a}d_a^2\big|[a]\big|^2|\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{0})|^2\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}\frac{\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g})}{\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{0})}\\&=d_a^2\big|[a]\big|^2\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}\sum_{\pi_a}\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{g})\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{0})\\&=d_a^2\big|[a]\big|^2\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}|G_a|\delta_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0}}\\&=d_a^2|G|\cdot\big|[a]\big|\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}\delta_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0}}.\end{aligned} \tag{419}$$

From this result, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_{\mathcal{C}/G} &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}/G}} \sum_{([a_{\mathbf{g}}],\pi_a)\in\mathcal{C}/G} d^2_{([a],\pi_a)}\theta_{([a],\pi_a)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}/G}} \sum_{[a_{\mathbf{g}}]} d_a^2|G|\cdot\big|[a]\big|\theta_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}\delta_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{[a_{\mathbf{0}}]} d_a^2\big|[a]\big|\theta_a = \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}} d_a^2\theta_a \\ &= \Theta_{\mathbf{0}} = \Theta_{\mathcal{C}}. \end{aligned} \tag{420}$$

Thus $\mathcal{C}/G$ has the same chiral central charge mod 8 as $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$.

Given the topological twists and fusion rules, we essentially have the complete modular data of the UMTC $\mathcal{C}/G$, since the quantum dimensions can be obtained from the fusion rules and the $S$-matrix is defined in terms of these quantities by Eq. (37). We now derive an expression for $S_{\overline{([a],\pi_a)}([b],\pi_b)}$ in terms of the $G$-crossed $S$-matrix of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ [where we use the topological charge conjugate of $([a],\pi_a)$ to simplify the subsequent expressions]

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\overline{([a],\pi_a)}([b],\pi_b)} &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}/G}} \sum_{([c],\pi_c)} N_{([a],\pi_a)([b],\pi_b)}^{([c],\pi_c)} d_{([c],\pi_c)} \frac{\theta_{([c],\pi_c)}}{\theta_{([a],\pi_a)}\theta_{([b],\pi_b)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{|G|\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s})\in G_a\backslash G/G_b} \sum_{[c]}\sum_{\pi_c} d_c\big|[c]\big| \frac{\theta_{c_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}}}}{\theta_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}\theta_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}} \frac{\chi_{\pi_c}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})}{\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})} \\ &\qquad \times \frac{n_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a} n_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}}{|H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}|} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}} \chi^*_{\pi_c}(\mathbf{k})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}(\mathbf{k})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}(\mathbf{k}) \sum_\mu [U_{\mathbf{k}}({}^{\mathbf{t}}a_{\mathbf{g}},\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b_{\mathbf{h}};c_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}})]_{\mu\mu}. \end{aligned} \tag{421}$$

Here $n_\pi \equiv \chi_\pi(\mathbf{0}) = \dim\pi$, and we used Eqs. (399), (406), (407), (412), and (B8). We may chose to use any representatives of the topological charge orbits in this expression, but we have specifically chosen to use $c\in[c]$ such that $c\in\mathcal{C}_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}}$ (corresponding to the choices $a_{\mathbf{g}}\in[a]$ and $b_{\mathbf{h}}\in[b]$) in order to make the evaluation more direct. The sum breaks into three parts: (1) a sum over $(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s})\in G_a\backslash G/G_b$, (2) a sum over $G$-orbits $[c]$, and (3) a sum over irreducible $\eta_c$-representations $\pi_c$. We first carry out the sum over $\pi_c$. In order to apply the orthogonality relation Eq. (B14), we notice that, in $G_c$, ${}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}$ by itself forms an $\eta_c$-regular conjugacy class and its centralizer is $G_c$. Thus, we can apply Eq. (B14) to evaluate the sum

$$\sum_{\pi_c}\chi_{\pi_c}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})\chi^*_{\pi_c}(\mathbf{k}) = |G_c|\delta_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}}. \tag{422}$$

Since $\mathbf{k}\in H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}$, we conclude that in order to have $\mathbf{k} = {}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}$ (so that the sum is non-vanishing), we must have ${}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\in G_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}b}$ and ${}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}\in G_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}$. Using these properties to evaluate the sums over $\pi_c$ and $\mathbf{k}$, we obtain

$$S_{\overline{([a],\pi_a)}([b],\pi_b)} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s})\in G_a\backslash G/G_b} \sum_{\substack{[c]\\ c\in\mathcal{C}_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}}}} d_c \frac{n_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a} n_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}}{|H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}|} \frac{\theta_c}{\theta_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}\theta_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}b}} \frac{\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})}{\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})} \sum_\mu [U_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}}({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)]_{\mu\mu}, \tag{423}$$

where we indicate the choice $c\in\mathcal{C}_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}}$ on the $[c]$ sum in order to reduce clutter. We further notice that

$$\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}) = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\pi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})\right] = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\eta_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g},\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})^{-1}\pi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g})\pi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}({}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})\right] = \eta_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g},\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})^{-1}\frac{\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g})}{n_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}}\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}), \tag{424}$$

where we have used the fact that $\pi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g})\propto\mathbb{1}$. There is a similar relation for $\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})$. From these relations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\overline{([a],\pi_a)}([b],\pi_b)} &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s})\in G_a\backslash G/G_b} \sum_{\substack{[c]\\ c\in\mathcal{C}_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}}}} \frac{d_c}{|H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}|} \frac{\theta_c}{\theta_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}\theta_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}b}} \frac{\sum_\mu [U_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}}({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)]_{\mu\mu}}{\eta_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g},\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})\eta_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}b}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g},\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})} \chi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s})\in G_a\backslash G/G_b} \sum_{[c]} \frac{d_c}{|H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}|} \sum_{\mu,\nu} [R_c^{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b}]_{\mu\nu}[R_c^{{}^{\mathbf{s}}b\,{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}]_{\nu\mu}\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}), \end{aligned} \tag{425}$$

where we used the $G$-crossed ribbon identity Eq. (296) in the last step. (We can now drop the $c\in\mathcal{C}_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h}}$, since this condition is implicitly enforced by the $R$-symbols.)

Thus, we have found

$$S_{\overline{([a],\pi_a)},([b],\pi_b)} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s})\in G_a\backslash G/G_b} \sum_{[c]} \frac{d_c}{|H_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}|} \mathrm{Tr}\left[R_c^{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b}R_c^{{}^{\mathbf{s}}b\,{}^{\mathbf{t}}a}\right]\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}). \tag{426}$$

By sliding a line over a double braid and applying Eq. (266), we can show (when ${}^{\mathbf{h}}a = a$ and ${}^{\mathbf{g}}b = b$) that

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left[R_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}c}^{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{h}}} R_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}c}^{{}^{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{h}}\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}\right] = \frac{\eta_b(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{k}})\eta_a(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}{\eta_b(\bar{\mathbf{k}},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g})\eta_a(\bar{\mathbf{k}},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{h})}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[R_c^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}} R_c^{b_{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}\right]. \tag{427}$$

Using Eq. (398), we also have

$$\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{h}) = \frac{\eta_a(\bar{\mathbf{k}},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{h})}{\eta_a(\mathbf{h},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{h}), \qquad \chi_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g}) = \frac{\eta_b(\bar{\mathbf{k}},{}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g})}{\eta_b(\mathbf{g},\bar{\mathbf{k}})}\chi_{\pi_b}(\mathbf{g}). \tag{428}$$

Putting these together, we find the relation

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left[R_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}c}^{{}^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{h}}} R_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}c}^{{}^{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{h}}\,{}^{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}\right]\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{h})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g}) = \mathrm{Tr}\left[R_c^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}} R_c^{b_{\mathbf{h}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}\right]\chi_{\pi_a}(\mathbf{h})\chi_{\pi_b}(\mathbf{g}), \tag{429}$$

which shows that this quantity is invariant under $G$ action.

Finally, we carry out the sum over the orbits $[c]$, replacing it with a sum over the actual topological charges $c \in \mathcal{C}_G^\times$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\overline{([a_{\mathbf{g}}],\pi_a)}([b_{\mathbf{h}}],\pi_b)} &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s})\in G_a\backslash G/G_b} \sum_{[c]} \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in G} \frac{d_{\mathbf{k}c}}{|H_{(\,{}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;\,c)}|}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[R_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}c}^{{}^{\mathbf{kt}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{ks}}b} R_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}c}^{{}^{\mathbf{ks}}b\,{}^{\mathbf{kt}}a}\right]\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{kt}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{ks}}\mathbf{h})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{ks}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{kt}}\mathbf{g}) \\ &= \frac{1}{|G|\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s})\in G_a\backslash G/G_b} \sum_{[c]} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in G/H_{(\,{}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;\,c)}} d_{\mathbf{k}c}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[R_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}c}^{{}^{\mathbf{kt}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{ks}}b} R_{{}^{\mathbf{k}}c}^{{}^{\mathbf{ks}}b\,{}^{\mathbf{kt}}a}\right]\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{kt}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{ks}}\mathbf{h})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{ks}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{kt}}\mathbf{g}). \end{aligned} \tag{430}$$

We write $\mathbf{k} \in G/H_{(\,{}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;\,c)}$ as $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{l}\mathbf{k}_1$ where $\mathbf{k}_1 \in G_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a} \cap G_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}b} \cap G/H_{(\,{}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;\,c)} \equiv M_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}$ and $\mathbf{l} \in [G/H_{(\,{}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;\,c)}]/M_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)} \equiv L_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b)}$. We purposefully drop the index $c$ in the definition of $L$, since $L$ contains cosets of elements that at least change one of ${}^{\mathbf{t}}a$ and ${}^{\mathbf{s}}b$, without referencing to $c$. In other words, $\mathbf{k}_1$ are all elements in $G/H_{(\,{}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;\,c)}$ that keep both ${}^{\mathbf{t}}a$ and ${}^{\mathbf{s}}b$ invariant and by definition necessarily transforms $c$ nontrivially within the same orbit. Once we sum over those $\mathbf{k}_1$ and $[c]$, we actually have a sum over all $c$ in ${}^{\mathbf{t}}a \times {}^{\mathbf{s}}b$:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\overline{([a_{\mathbf{g}}],\pi_a)}([b_{\mathbf{h}}],\pi_b)} &= \frac{1}{|G|\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{0}}} \sum_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s})\in G_a\backslash G/G_b} \sum_{\mathbf{l}\in L_{(\,{}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b)}} \sum_{[c]} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1\in M_{({}^{\mathbf{t}}a,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b;c)}} d_{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{k}_1 c}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[R_{{}^{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{k}_1}c}^{{}^{\mathbf{lt}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{ls}}b} R_{{}^{\mathbf{l}\mathbf{k}_1}c}^{{}^{\mathbf{ls}}b\,{}^{\mathbf{lt}}a}\right]\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{lt}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{ls}}\mathbf{h})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{ls}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{lt}}\mathbf{g}) \\ &= \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s})\in G_a\backslash G/G_b} \sum_{\mathbf{l}\in L_{(\,{}^{\mathbf{t}}a,\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b)}} S_{{}^{\mathbf{lt}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{ls}}b}\,\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{lt}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{ls}}\mathbf{h})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{ls}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{lt}}\mathbf{g}) \end{aligned} \tag{431}$$

Now recall that the double coset $G_a\backslash G/G_b$ is defined as the equivalence classes of elements in $G/G_a \times G/G_b$, under the diagonal left multiplication. Therefore carrying out the sum over $\mathbf{l}$ is equivalent to lift the double coset back to $G/G_a \times G/G_b$. Finally we arrive at the following expression:

$$S_{\overline{([a_{\mathbf{g}}],\pi_a)}([b_{\mathbf{h}}],\pi_b)} = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{t}\in G/G_a \\ \mathbf{s}\in G/G_b}} S_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b}\,\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}({}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}({}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}). \tag{432}$$

We can now use Eqs. (308), (410), and (B5) to rewrite this final expression as

$$S_{([a_{\mathbf{g}}],\pi_a)([b_{\mathbf{h}}],\pi_b)} = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{t}\in G/G_a \\ \mathbf{s}\in G/G_b}} S_{{}^{\mathbf{t}}a_{\mathbf{g}}\,{}^{\mathbf{s}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}\,\chi_{\overline{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\pi_a}}({}^{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{h})\,\chi_{{}^{\mathbf{s}}\pi_b}\left(\overline{{}^{\mathbf{t}}\mathbf{g}}\right). \tag{433}$$

Thus, we have found that the $S$-matrix of the gauged UMTC $\mathcal{C}/G$ can be obtained from the $S$-matrix of the corresponding $G$-crossed UMTC $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ by taking a linear combination of $S$-matrix elements that is weighted by the projective characters of the corresponding projective irreps.

In general, gauge-inequivalent $G$-crossed extensions always lead to distinct $\mathcal{C}/G$ as topological gauge theories. However, when viewed as UMTCs (so that we neglect the origin of the charge and flux labels of the quasiparticles in $\mathcal{C}/G$), different $G$-crossed extensions can potentially result in the same $\mathcal{C}/G$. Examples of such phenomena have been noticed for gauging bosonic SPT phases in Refs. [52, 74].

### D. Genus $g$ Ground State Degeneracy

An alternative way of computing a number of properties of $\mathcal{C}/G$ is by computing the ground state degeneracy $\mathcal{N}_g$ of the theory on a genus $g$ surface. It is well-known that this is related to the quantum dimensions of $\mathcal{C}/G$ via the formula (which can be derived using the Verlinde formula)

$$\mathcal{N}_g = \mathcal{D}^{2g-2} \sum_{A\in\mathcal{C}/G} d_A^{-(2g-2)}. \tag{434}$$

Therefore, knowledge of $\mathcal{N}_g$ for enough values of $g$ can be used to extract the quantum dimensions $d_j$ for every topological charge $A \in \mathcal{C}/G$.

The ground state degeneracy $\mathcal{N}_g$ of $\mathcal{C}/G$ can also be obtained from the genus $g$ ground state degeneracy of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, which was discussed in Sec. VII B, by projecting onto the $G$-invariant subspace of states. In other words, we consider every state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_{\{\mathbf{g}_j,\mathbf{h}_j\}}$ for every $\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}$-sector. As discussed in Sec. VII C, these states transform under the $G$ action. The projection keeps only the subspace of states that are invariant under this $G$-action. That is, one takes

$$|\psi^G\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{g}\in G} \rho_{\mathbf{g}}(|\psi\rangle), \tag{435}$$

for each state $|\psi\rangle$, belonging to any $\{\mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{h}_j\}$-sector of the $G$-crossed theory. The ground state degeneracy $\mathcal{N}_g$ is then the dimension of the space spanned by such $G$-invariant states $|\psi^G\rangle$.

### E. Universality Classes of Topological Phase Transitions

A wide class of quantum phase transitions between topologically distinct phases of matter can be understood in terms of the condensation of some set of "bosonic" quasiparticles [75, 106], i.e. those whose topological charge $a$ has trivial topological twist $\theta_a = 1$. In these cases, the topological properties of the resulting phase can be derived from those of the parent phase – some of the topological charge values (quasiparticle types) become confined due to the new condensate, some are equated with other topological charges, related to each other by fusion with the condensed bosons, but otherwise go through the transition essentially unmodified, and others may split into multiple distinct types of topological charge when going through the transition. We note that the mathematics underlying these transitions was initially developed in Refs. [104, 105].

Most of the current understanding of such topological phase transitions focuses on the formal mathematical structure, such as the nature of the topological order on the two sides of the transition. However, another very important property of a phase transition is its universality class. For the simplest cases, where only one boson $a$ with fusion $a \times a = 0$ condenses, it has been shown that the resulting phase transitions can be understood as $\mathbb{Z}_2$ gauge-symmetry breaking transitions [76, 78]. Here, we will extend these results to a more general understanding of the universality classes of topological bose condensation transitions.

Let us consider a topological phase of matter described by a UMTC $\mathcal{M}$ that contains a subtheory $\mathcal{B}$, which is itself a UBTC (i.e. it contains topological charges that are closed under fusion) with the following properties: (a) all the topological twists are trivial, i.e. $\theta_a = 1,\ \forall a \in \mathcal{B}$, and (b) $\mathcal{D}S_{ab} = d_a d_b,\ \forall a, b \in \mathcal{B}$. In other words, the subcategory $\mathcal{B}$ is symmetric, which means braiding is completely trivial, i.e. $R^{aa} = R^{ab}R^{ba} = \mathbb{1}$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{B}$.

When these conditions are satisfied, a theorem due to Deligne [137] guarantees that $\mathcal{B}$ is gauge-equivalent to the category $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$ for some finite group $G$. This category $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$ has its topological charges given by all irreducible linear representations of $G$, with the fusion rules being precisely given by the tensor product of the irreducible representations and the $F$-symbols being given by the corresponding Wigner $6j$-symbols. The braiding of $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$ is symmetric, i.e. completely trivial. We notice, however, that one generally does need the full knowledge of $F$-symbols and $R$-symbols of $\mathcal{B}$ to unambiguously recover the group $G$ from the representation category [138].

In such a case, one can always condense the quasiparticles belonging to $\mathcal{B}$ following the formal rules given in Refs. [75, 106, 107]. Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the phase obtained by condensing the $\mathcal{B}$ quasiparticles in $\mathcal{M}$. It was proven in Ref. [139] that $\mathcal{M}$ can always be obtained by starting from $\mathcal{C}$, and gauging a symmetry group $G$. This implies the following property of the topological phase transition:

*The universality class of topological quantum phase transitions corresponding to the condensation of a Rep(G) subset of a UMTC can be understood as discrete gauge symmetry breaking transitions associated with the finite group $G$.*

Since discrete gauge symmetry breaking transitions are well-understood and can be simulated easily using numerical methods or, in simple cases, through analytical methods, this means that we can immediately understand the critical exponents for local correlations of this much wider class of topological quantum phase transitions. [183]

## IX. CLASSIFICATION OF SYMMETRY ENRICHED TOPOLOGICAL PHASES

We have developed a general framework to understand the interplay of symmetry and topological order in $2+1$ dimensions. Our work leads to a systematic classification and characterization of SET phases in $2+1$ dimensions, for unitary symmetry groups $G$, which describe on-site and/or translation symmetries, based on inequivalent solutions of the defect theory $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$. Our formalism for $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ encapsulates in detail the properties of the extrinsic **g**-defects and the way in which symmetries relate to the topological order. Below we will describe the classification of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ and discuss the relation to the PSG framework for classifying SET phases. The extension to continuous, other spatial (non-on-site), or anti-unitary symmetries will also be be briefly discussed below.

### A. Classification of $G$-Crossed Extensions

One can, in principle, obtain all $G$-crossed BTCs by solving the consistency equations. In practice, this can quickly become computationally intractable. Fortunately, addressing this problem is aided by the theorems of Ref. [81], which classify the $G$-crossed extensions of a BTC $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ for finite groups $G$ (and also extensions of fusion categories). In our paper, we restrict our attention to the case where $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ is a UMTC.

We have already examined part of this classification in detail in our paper. The most basic part of the classification, discussed in Sec. III, is the choice of the symmetry action $[\rho] : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}})$, which is incorporated as a fundamental property of the defects of the extended theory.

The next part of the classification was discussed in Sec. IV, where we showed that, given a specific symmetry action $[\rho]$, the symmetry fractionalization is classified by $H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$. This required that the obstruction class $[\mathfrak{O}] \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ be trivial $[\mathfrak{O}] = [0]$, since, otherwise, there would be no solutions. More precisely, the symmetry fractionalization classes were given by the equivalence classes of solutions $[\mathfrak{w}]$, which are elements of an $H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ torsor. This means distinct classes of solutions are obtained from each other by action of distinct elements of $H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$. In particular, the $U_{\mathbf{g}}(a, b; c)$ and $\eta_x(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h})$ transformations of a $G$-crossed MTC $\mathcal{C}^\times_G$ (or, rather, their restriction to the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ sector) are precisely the symmetry action transformations of fusion vertex states and symmetry fractionalization projective phases, respectively, that encoded symmetry fractionalization. Similarly, the $G$-crossed consistency relations of the $U_{\mathbf{g}}(a, b; c)$ and $\eta_x(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h})$ transformations are precisely the corresponding consistency relations that arose in the fractionalization analysis. Thus, the $H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ classification of symmetry fractionalization carries over to the $G$-crossed extensions of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$, where the defects in the extended theory incorporate the symmetry action through the braiding operations.

In this sense, the set of gauge inequivalent $G$-crossed MTCs that are extensions of a MTC $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ with specified $[\rho]$ is an $H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ torsor. By this, we mean that, given a $G$-crossed MTC $\mathcal{C}^\times_G$, each element $[\mathfrak{t}] \in H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ specifies a potential way of modifying $\mathcal{C}^\times_G$ to obtain a distinct, gauge inequivalent $G$-crossed MTC $\hat{\mathcal{C}}^\times_G$, with a different fractionalization class $[\hat{\mathfrak{w}}] = [\mathfrak{t} \times \mathfrak{w}]$. From the above discussion, it is clear that an important property of a $G$-crossed extension that is modified by $[\mathfrak{t}]$ in this way is the symmetry action and fractionalization that is encoded in the defects, particularly their action with respect to the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ sector.

We can also see that, for a choice of $\mathfrak{t} \in [\mathfrak{t}]$, the $G$-graded fusion rules of the defects in $\mathcal{C}^\times_G$ are modified to become

$$a_{\mathbf{g}} \times b_{\mathbf{h}} = \mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}) \times \sum_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}} N^{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}_{a_{\mathbf{g}} b_{\mathbf{h}}} c_{\mathbf{gh}}, \tag{436}$$

so that the fusion coefficients of the modified theory $\hat{\mathcal{C}}^\times_G$ are given by

$$\hat{N}^{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}_{a_{\mathbf{g}} b_{\mathbf{h}}} = N^{\overline{\mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \times c_{\mathbf{gh}}}_{a_{\mathbf{g}} b_{\mathbf{h}}}. \tag{437}$$

It follows from the 2-cocycle condition on $\mathfrak{t}$ that these modified fusion coefficients automatically provide an associative fusion algebra. We note that such a modification may or may not actually give a distinct fusion algebra. Clearly, the rest of the basic data of $\mathcal{C}^\times_G$ will also be modified by $[\mathfrak{t}]$, but we will not go into these details here.

Importantly, while there is a different symmetry fractionalization class $[\mathfrak{w}]$ for each element $[\mathfrak{t}] \in H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$, it is not guaranteed that each $[\mathfrak{w}]$ can be consistently extended to define a full $G$-crossed defect theory $\hat{\mathcal{C}}^\times_G$. In fact, the symmetry fractionalization class defines a new obstruction class in $H^4(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ [81]. Only when this obstruction class is trivial can a $G$-crossed BTC $\hat{\mathcal{C}}^\times_G$ be constructed, as there would otherwise be no solutions to the $G$-crossed consistency conditions. When this obstruction vanishes, the classification theorem established in Ref. [81] says that the remaining multiplicity of $G$-crossed extensions (after specifiying $[\rho]$ and $[\mathfrak{w}]$) is classified by $H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$. The set of $G$-crossed extensions (with specified symmetry action and symmetry fractionalization class) is an $H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ torsor in a similar sense as above. In particular, given a $G$-crossed MTC $\mathcal{C}^\times_G$, each element $[\alpha] \in H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ specifies a way of modifying $\mathcal{C}^\times_G$ to obtain a distinct, gauge inequivalent $G$-crossed MTC $\hat{\mathcal{C}}^\times_G$ with the same symmetry action and fractionalization class.

We now describe how one may modify a particular $G$-crossed theory $\mathcal{C}^\times_G$ to obtain another $G$-crossed theory $\hat{\mathcal{C}}^\times_G$, for a given $[\alpha] \in H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$. We first note that the bosonic SPT states for symmetry group $G$ are completely classified by the elements $[\alpha] \in H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$, as discussed in Sec. X A. We will denote these states as $\mathrm{SPT}^{[\alpha]}_G$. Then it is easy to see that, for each $[\alpha]$, we can produce another $G$-crossed theory by factoring in SPT states in such a way that the group element labels match up with those of $\mathcal{C}^\times_G$, i.e. we take the restricted product

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}^\times_G = \mathrm{SPT}^{[\alpha]}_G \times \mathcal{C}^\times_G \Big|_{(\mathbf{g}, a_{\mathbf{g}})}, \tag{438}$$

where topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ from the $G$-crossed theory are paired up with $\mathbf{g}$-defects from the SPT. To be more explicit, for a choice of $\alpha \in [\alpha]$, that is, a 3-cocycle $\alpha \in Z^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$, and the choice of gauge, given in Sec. X A, that makes all the braiding phases trivial for $\mathrm{SPT}^{[\alpha]}_G$, the basic data of $\mathcal{C}^\times_G$ can be modified as

$$\hat{N}_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}^{c_{\mathbf{gh}}} = N_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}^{c_{\mathbf{gh}}} \tag{439}$$

$$\left[\hat{F}_{d_{\mathbf{ghk}}}^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}c_{\mathbf{k}}}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)} = \alpha(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\left[F_{d_{\mathbf{ghk}}}^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}c_{\mathbf{k}}}\right]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)} \tag{440}$$

$$\left[\hat{R}_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}\right]_{\mu\nu} = \left[R_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}\right]_{\mu\nu} \tag{441}$$

$$\left[\hat{U}_{\mathbf{k}}(a_{\mathbf{g}},b_{\mathbf{h}};c_{\mathbf{gh}})\right]_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\alpha(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{k},\,{}^{\overline{\mathbf{k}}}\mathbf{h})}{\alpha(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\alpha(\mathbf{k},\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}\mathbf{g},\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}\mathbf{h})}U_{\mathbf{k}}(a_{\mathbf{g}},b_{\mathbf{h}};c_{\mathbf{gh}}) \tag{442}$$

$$\hat{\eta}_{x_{\mathbf{k}}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \frac{\alpha(\mathbf{g},\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}\mathbf{k},\mathbf{h})}{\alpha(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\,{}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}}}\mathbf{k})\alpha(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}\eta_{x_{\mathbf{k}}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) \tag{443}$$

to give the basic data of $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_G^\times$, which automatically satisfies $G$-crossed consistency conditions. We note that, since $\alpha(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = 1$ if $\mathbf{g}$, $\mathbf{h}$, or $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{0}$, the transformations $\hat{U}_{\mathbf{k}}(a_{\mathbf{0}},b_{\mathbf{0}};c_{\mathbf{0}}) = U_{\mathbf{k}}(a_{\mathbf{0}},b_{\mathbf{0}};c_{\mathbf{0}})$ and $\hat{\eta}_{x_{\mathbf{0}}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \eta_{x_{\mathbf{0}}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ with respect to the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ sector are unchanged by the above modification. Thus, such modifications of a $G$-crossed theory leaves the symmetry action $[\rho] : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}})$ and symmetry fractionalization class $[\mathfrak{w}]$ fixed.

We believe modifications of this type precisely give the $H^3(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$ classification, or, in other words, they generate all gauge inequivalent $G$-crossed MTCs for a specified symmetry action and symmetry fractionalization class.We refer to such distinct $G$-crossed theories with the same symmetry action and fractionalization class as having different defect associativity classes.

It is straightforward to check that when $\alpha \in B^3(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$ is a 3-coboundary, i.e. when

$$\alpha(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = \mathrm{d}\varepsilon(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\varepsilon(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{hk})}{\varepsilon(\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{k})\varepsilon(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})} \tag{444}$$

for some $\varepsilon \in C^2(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$, that the above modification of the $G$-crossed theory by $\alpha$ produces a $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_G^\times$ that is gauge equivalent to $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ through the vertex basis and symmetry action gauge transformations

$$\left[\Gamma_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}^{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{h}}}\right]_{\mu\nu} = \varepsilon(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})\delta_{\mu\nu} \tag{445}$$

$$\gamma_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{k})}{\varepsilon(\mathbf{k},\bar{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{g}\mathbf{k})}. \tag{446}$$

This establishes the fact that one should take a quotient by $B^3(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$, since such modifications are just gauge transformations. What remains to be shown is that every pair of $G$-crossed extensions of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ with the same symmetry action $[\rho]$ and fractionalization class $[\mathfrak{w}]$ is related by such a modification for some 3-cocycle $\alpha \in Z^3(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$ and that distinct cohomology classes $[\alpha]$ give gauge inequivalent solutions. We do not establish this here, but note that it may be partially verified (or wholly verified for simple enough examples) using invariants of the $G$-crossed or gauged theory, and it is true for all the examples we study in Sec. X. The classification is established in Ref. [81] by working at a higher category level, with the subsectors $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ (which are $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ bimodules) playing the role of objects.

In summary, the $G$-crossed extensions of a MTC $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ for finite group $G$ are classified by the symmetry action $[\rho]$, the symmetry fractionalization class $[\mathfrak{w}]$, which is an element of a $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ torsor, and the defect associativity class, which is an element of a $H^3(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$ torsor. This yields the classification of $2+1$ dimensional SET phases for a system in a topological phase described by a UMTC $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ and an (on-site) global unitary symmetry described by a finite group $G$. Based on the classification theorem of Ref. [81], we believe that all of the inequivalent $G$-crossed extensions can be parameterized in this way.

### 1. *On relabeling topological charges*

Before we conclude this section, we emphasize one additional point regarding the equivalence of distinct solutions of the consistency equations for $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$. In some cases, different fractionalization classes $[\mathfrak{w}]$ can be related to each other by a relabeling of the topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$, i.e. the quasiparticle types. In these cases, one might naïvely think that fractionalization classes that are related in this manner should be identified as the same SET phase, but this is not correct. The different fractionalization classes classified by $H^2_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ should be considered to be associated with distinct SET phases, even if they are related by a relabeling of the topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$.

As a simple example that illustrates the main idea involved here, consider the case of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ toric code model, for which the topological charges are $\{I,e,m,\psi\}$, and let $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ with $\rho$ acting trivially on the topological charges (i.e. no permutations). This example is examined in Sec.X G. In this case, the fractionalization is classified by $H^2(\mathbb{Z}_2,\mathbb{Z}_2\times\mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2\times\mathbb{Z}_2$, which physically corresponds to whether the $e$ and $m$ quasiparticles carry fractional $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charges. The fractionalization class where $e$ carries half-integer $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge and $m$ carries integer $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge is therefore related to the one where $e$ carries integer $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge and $m$ carries half-integer $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge by the relabeling $e \leftrightarrow m$. Nevertheless, these are distinct phases of matter. To understand why this is the case, first break the

global $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry and pick a single point in phase diagram (i.e. a single point in the space of Hamiltonians that realize the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ toric code model). At this point in the parameter space, we can make a choice of labeling $\{I, e, m, \psi\}$ for each of the different types of topological excitations. Next, we can adiabatically vary the parameters of the Hamiltonian away from this point, while staying in the same topological phase. Doing this allows us to extend the labeling $\{I, e, m, \psi\}$ of topological excitations to all other points in the phase diagram that can be reached adiabatically without closing the gap. In other words, this provides a way of fixing the labeling of quasiparticle types, i.e. topological charges, in a consistent way throughout the (adiabatically connected) toric code phase.

Once the labeling of topological charges has been fixed everywhere in the toric code phase space, we can then consider the subset of the toric code phase space that is $\mathbb{Z}_2$-symmetric. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$-symmetric phase diagram will break up into disjoint regions, where different SETs cannot be continuously connected without either breaking the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry or closing the energy gap and thus passing through a phase transition. The region where $e$ and $m$ respectively have half-integer and integer $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge cannot be adiabatically connected to the region where $e$ and $m$ respectively have integer and half-integer $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge.

From this simple example, we see that two SETs associated with different fractionalization classes cannot be adiabatically connected, even if they can be related by relabeling the topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$. It is also worth remarking that the phases are only distinct relative to each other, since the data of their associated defect theories $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ can be related to each other by relabeling the topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$. This is at the heart of the statement that the set of fractionalization classes is an $H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ torsor.

In light of this discussion, we do not allow the relabeling of the topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ when determining whether two $G$-crossed theories should be considered equivalent. However, the argument given above does not apply to the possible relabeling of $G$-defects. Specifically, when the $G$ symmetry is broken, the $\mathbf{g}$-defects are no longer well-defined objects. Consequently, we expect that distinct $G$-crossed theories that can be related by relabeling elements within $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$, for $\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{0}$, should be considered physically equivalent. In Sec. X G 1, we discuss an example where two solutions for $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ related by distinct $\text{SPT}_G^{[\alpha]}$ are equivalent under such a relabeling of the $\mathbf{g}$-defects. In other words, allowing the relabeling of defect types within the same $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ sector (with $\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{0}$) can relate solutions associated with distinct classes in $H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$. This particular example was discussed previously from a different perspective, using Chern-Simons field theory, in Refs. [52, 140]. Another example of this kind is discussed in Sec. X F.

### B. Relation to PSG Framework

At this stage, it is worth understanding how the framework that we have developed for classifying and characterizing SETs relates to the projective symmetry group (PSG) classification proposed in Ref. [38]. A complementary discussion can also be found in Ref. [51]. In the PSG formulation, a topological phase is considered with a low-energy description in terms of a gauge theory with gauge group $H$ and a global symmetry $G$. Different PSGs are classified by different mean-field solutions within a slave-particle framework [1]. A crucial role is played by group extensions, labelled $PSG$, of $H$ by $G$, which mathematically means $PSG/H = G$. It is not clear whether the classification of different slave-particle mean-field solutions, as originally formulated in Ref. [38], is equivalent to classifying the group extensions $PSG$ such that $PSG/H = G$. Nevertheless, each such mean-field solution must be described by such a group extension, even if the correspondence is not one-to-one. Here, we will briefly discuss the problem of classification of such group extensions, and compare the results to our approach.

When $G$ and $H$ are both finite, the mathematical problem of classifying group extensions has the following solution [141]. One first picks a map $\tilde{\rho} : G \to \mathrm{Out}(H)$, where $\mathrm{Out}(H)$ is the group of outer automorphisms of $H$. Different group extensions are then classified by $H^2_{\tilde{\rho}}(G, \mathrm{Z}(H))$, where $\mathrm{Z}(H)$ denotes the center of $H$. [184] When $H$ is finite and the topological phase is fully described by a discrete $H$ gauge theory, i.e. $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ is the (untwisted) quantum double of $H$, then we see that the classification of distinct group extensions $PSG$ forms only a subset of the classification that we have developed in this paper. This is because $\mathrm{Z}(H)$ is only a subset of the Abelian anyons $\mathcal{A}$. [185] Furthermore, even when one specifies the symmetry fractionalization class according to $H^2_{\tilde{\rho}}(G, \mathrm{Z}(H))$, there are still additional possibilities for distinct SETs, as indicated by the $H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ part of the classification of $G$-crossed extensions $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$. Through the simple example of a topological phase described by pure discrete $H$ gauge theory, we see that these are also not captured by classifying the different group extensions $PSG$.

Another important distinction between the PSG approach and our approach is that the former requires knowledge of $H$, which is, in general, not unique and difficult to determine when given a generic topological phase in terms of an UMTC $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$.

Ref. [53] has proposed an alternative framework, besides PSG, to classify the SET phases of quantum doubles of a discrete group (i.e. discrete gauge field theories). This classification is also incomplete for those classes of states, as it misses the full set of symmetry fractionalization classes $H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ described in this paper.

### C. Continuous, Spatial, and Anti-Unitary Symmetries

The theory that we have developed in this paper is most complete when $\mathcal{C}$ is a UMTC, and the symmetry $G$ is a finite, on-site unitary symmetry. However, much of the framework we have developed applies more generally as well.

Our general discussion of the symmetry of topological phases in Sec. III and symmetry fractionalization in Sec. IV is valid for any general symmetry $G$. However, when spatial symmeries are considered, there may be additional con-

straints on what types of symmetry fractionalization are allowed [119–123]. We leave a systematic study of this for future work.

When $G$ is continuous, one also requires additional conditions that the maps $\rho : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ respect the continuity of $G$ by mapping all group elements in a single connected component of $G$ to the same element of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. The cochains valued in $\mathcal{A}$, such as the $\mathfrak{O}$ and $\mathfrak{w}$ described in Secs. III and IV, should similarly respect the continuity of $G$.

Similarly, the definition of $\mathbf{g}$-defects and the notion of topologically distinct types of $\mathbf{g}$-defects is valid (or can be straightforwardly generalized) for any unobstructed unitary symmetry $G$, even if it is not discrete and on-site. It is unclear how to generalize the constructions and formalism of defects to include anti-unitary symmetries, as the complex conjugation operation is inherently nonlocal (except when acting on product states and operators).

When $G$ is not a finite group, our formalism for $G$-crossed UBTCs described in Sec. VI may still be applied as long as fusion is finite, meaning there are only a finite number of fusion outcomes when fusing two topological charges. The discussion of $G$-crossed modularity for general $G$ requires the further restriction that $|\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}|$ be finite for all $\mathbf{g}$, but again does not require $G$ to be finite.

When $G$ is a continuous group, the consistency conditions that we have described in Sec. VI are not complete. In particular, the basic data of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, such as the $F$, $R$, $U$, and $\eta$ symbols, must somehow reflect the topology and continuity of the group $G$. For SPT states, which consist of the case where the original category $\mathcal{C}$ is trivial, it was argued in Ref. [47] that when $G$ is continuous the classification is given in terms of Borel cohomology $H^3_B(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$. In our language, this amounts to the condition that the $F$-symbols of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ be Borel measurable functions on the group manifold. Therefore a natural assumption is that SETs with continuous symmetry $G$ are classified by distinct $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, with the additional condition that $F$, $R$, $U$, and $\eta$ be Borel measurable functions on the group manifold. However, a detailed study of $G$-crossed extensions for continuous $G$, in addition to the framework for gauging continuous $G$, will be left for future work.

In the case where $G$ contains spatial symmetries, such as translations, rotations, and reflections, we expect that the basic data and consistency conditions for $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ will be valid, although as mentioned above, additional constraints may need to be included that would impose additional important relations on the data of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$. A systematic study of these will also be left for future work.

Finally, we note that the classification theorems of Ref. [81] for $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ and, in particular, the statement that distinct $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ are fully classified by $([\rho], [\mathbf{t}], [\alpha])$ require that $G$ is a finite, on-site unitary symmetry.

## X. EXAMPLES

In this section, we consider a number of examples, which we label by the initial anyon model (UBTC) $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ and the symmetry group $G$. We obtain the data of the corresponding $G$-crossed UBTCs $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ by solving the consistency equations, using various properties and classification theorems when useful, and present as much of the basic data as is reasonable. We also present explicit derivations of the fusion rules and the modular data of the corresponding gauged theories $\mathcal{C}/G$.

The purpose of these examples is twofold: (1) to provide the basic data of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ and $\mathcal{C}/G$ for some of the more interesting and perhaps more physically relevant models, and (2) to illustrate the different types of nontrivial issues and structures that may arise when concrete calculations are performed. Most of the examples examined here have Abelian symmetry group $G$, but we thoroughly consider an example with a non-Abelian symmetry $G = S_3$. We use the final example to briefly present an example of a non-vanishing $H^3_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$ obstruction. Partial results from some of the examples that we examine have also been obtained in previous works [6, 9–12, 47, 77, 92, 100, 102, 103, 142–144], though mostly using different methods.

In the following, we adopt the convention that the vacuum topological charge is always referred to as either $0$ or $I$ and the identity element of $G$ is referred to as either $\mathbf{0}$ or $\mathbb{1}$.

### A. Trivial Bosonic State with $G$ symmetry

Consider the case where the starting topological phase $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ is trivial in the sense that it only contains topologically trivial bosonic excitations, i.e. $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}} = \{0\}$, but possesses a symmetry group $G$. This would describe a bosonic symmetry-protected topological (SPT) phase with symmetry group $G$. In this case the construction of the extended category $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ is straightforward. Each $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ contains a single defect type, which will be denoted by $\mathbf{g}$. Fusion of defects is given by group multiplication, i.e. $\mathbf{g} \times \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{gh}$. Since the fusion category $\mathcal{C}_G$ will appear elsewhere, we will refer to it as $\mathrm{Vec}_G$. Mathematically, this is the category of $G$-graded vector spaces. It is a well-known result that the equivalence classes of $F$-symbols under vertex basis gauge transformations are determined by the 3rd group cohomology $H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ [95, 143]. Given a 3-cocycle $\alpha \in Z^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$, we define the $F$-symbols as

$$[F^{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}}_{\mathbf{ghk}}]_{\mathbf{gh},\mathbf{hk}} = \alpha(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}). \tag{447}$$

As usual, we require $F^{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k}} = 1$ whenever any of $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}$ is $\mathbf{0}$, so we always impose this condition on the 3-cocycle $\alpha$. We can also always apply the symmetry action gauge transformation to set $R^{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}_{\mathbf{gh}} = 1$ for all values of $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{h}$. (If these were nontrivial in this example, we would apply the symmetry action gauge transformation $\gamma_{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{h}) = [R^{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}_{\mathbf{gh}}]^{-1}$ to remove any nontrivial braiding phases.) The corresponding braiding operators simply involve the $G$-action of group elements acting by conjugation. In this case, the corresponding $U_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\eta_{\mathbf{k}}$ are uniquely determined by the $G$-crossed consistency equations

to be

$$U_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h};\mathbf{gh}) = \frac{\alpha(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{k},{}^{\overline{\mathbf{k}}}\mathbf{h})}{\alpha(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},\mathbf{k})\alpha(\mathbf{k},{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}\mathbf{g},{}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}\mathbf{h})}, \quad (448)$$

$$\eta_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \frac{\alpha(\mathbf{g},{}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}\mathbf{k},\mathbf{h})}{\alpha(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h},{}^{\bar{\mathbf{h}}\bar{\mathbf{g}}}\mathbf{k})\alpha(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})}. \quad (449)$$

The $H^3(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$ classification of the $F$-symbols of the $G$-crossed extensions $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ for general $\mathcal{C}$ is therefore in one-to-one correspondence with the classification of 2D bosonic SPT states with symmetry group $G$ developed in Ref. [47]. Therefore, we see that *classifying $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ reproduces the classification of bosonic SPT states.*

The $G$ action on $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ (for $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ trivial) is obviously given simply by conjugation. Therefore, we immediately obtain the quasiparticle labels in the gauged theory as a pair $([\mathbf{g}],\pi_\mathbf{g})$ where $[\mathbf{g}]=\{\mathbf{hgh}^{-1},\forall\mathbf{h}\in G\}$ is a conjugacy class of $G$ (i.e. an orbit under $G$ action) and $\pi_\mathbf{g}$ is an irreducible projective representation of the stabilizer group, i.e. the centralizer of a representative element $\mathbf{g}\in[\mathbf{g}]$. If we consider trivial $F$-symbols on $\mathrm{Vec}_G$, we see that all $U$ and $\eta$ can be set to 1. The anyon content thus agrees exactly with the well-known quantum double construction $\mathrm{D}(G)$ of $G$. In general, the gauged theory is a twisted quantum double $\mathrm{D}^\alpha(G)$ [144–146].

For illustration, let us consider the $G$-crossed braiding for $G=\mathbb{Z}_N$. Since $G$ is Abelian, in the following we denote group multiplication in $G$ by addition $+$. The $G$-extension is simply $\mathrm{Vec}_G^\alpha$ equipped with a 3-cocycle

$$\alpha(a,b,c)=e^{\frac{2\pi ip}{N^2}a(b+c-[b+c]_N)}, \quad (450)$$

where we use the notation $[a]_N\equiv a \bmod N$. When there is no ambiguity we will also sometimes drop the subscript and write $[a]$ instead of $[a]_N$. In this case we find it more illustrative to choose a gauge in which $\eta\equiv 1$. We find the following solutions to the $G$-crossed heptagon equations

$$R^{ab}_{a+b}=e^{-\frac{2\pi ip}{N^2}[a]_N[b]_N}e^{\frac{2\pi im_a}{N}b}. \quad (451)$$

We can get the $U$ symbols

$$U_c(a,b;a+b)=e^{-\frac{4\pi ip}{N^2}c(a+b-[a+b]_N)}e^{\frac{2\pi i}{N}c(m_a+m_b-m_{a+b})}, \quad (452)$$

where $m_a\in\mathbb{Z}$. Clearly all the $m_a$'s are symmetry action gauge redundancy. The topological twists and double braid are given by

$$\theta_a = e^{-\frac{2\pi ip[a]_N^2}{N^2}}e^{\frac{2\pi iam_a}{N}}, \quad (453)$$

$$R^{ab}_{a+b}R^{ba}_{a+b} = e^{-\frac{4\pi ip}{N^2}[a]_N[b]_N}e^{\frac{2\pi i(m_ba+m_ab)}{N}}. \quad (454)$$

It is evident from these expressions that $m_a$ can be understood as the number of $\mathbb{Z}_N$ charges attached to the defect $a$, due to non-universal local energetics. This explains why these solutions should be considered as being gauge equivalent, since in the extended theory $\mathbb{Z}_N$ charges are still part of the vacuum sector.

Let us consider the gauged theory. Since $G$ is Abelian, each $a\in\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ is an $G$-orbit. They can also carry gauge charges labeled again by $n\in\mathbb{Z}_N$. We therefore obtain $|G|^2$ quasiparticles labeled by $(a,n)$. Their fusion rules are

$$(a,n)\times(a',n') = \left([a+a']_N,\left[n+n'-\frac{2p}{N}(a+a'-[a+a']_N)\right]_N\right), \quad (455)$$

where the additional gauge charges come from the nontrivial symmetry action on the fusion state of the defects. The topological twist of $(a,n)$ is then

$$\theta_{(a,n)}=e^{-\frac{2\pi ip[a]_N^2}{N^2}}e^{\frac{2\pi ina}{N}}. \quad (456)$$

These results agree exactly with the twisted quantum double $\mathrm{D}^\alpha(\mathbb{Z}_N)$ [144–147].

### B. Trivial Fermionic State $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}$ with $G$ symmetry

Our next example is to consider a trivial fermionic topological phase. Even though the fermion is a local excitation in such a case, it turns out to be useful to view it as a nontrivial element of the category and therefore to treat it as a topological charge. To describe such a situation, we use the UBTC with $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}=\{I,\psi\}$ where $I$ is the vacuum charge, $\psi$ is the fermion, and $\psi\times\psi=I$. $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ should be viewed therefore as a topological abstraction of gapped fermionic systems with only short-range entanglement.

The $F$-symbols and $R$-symbols are

$$[F^{\psi\psi\psi}_\psi]_{\psi\psi}=1, \quad R^{\psi\psi}_I=-1. \quad (457)$$

Notice that the braiding is not modular, since the $S$ matrix

$$S=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{bmatrix}1&1\\1&1\end{bmatrix} \quad (458)$$

is singular. We note that our results on classification of symmetry fractionalization do not directly apply, since modularity was an essential part of the argument. Using the notation of Appendix C, we will denote this category as $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}=\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}$.

Let us consider the extension of $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ by $G=\mathbb{Z}_2$. The extended category is $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded: $\mathcal{C}_G=\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}\bigoplus\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$, where $\mathbf{g}$ is the non-trivial element of $\mathbb{Z}_2$. As explained in Sec. VI A, we must have $\mathcal{D}_\mathbf{g}=\mathcal{D}_\mathbf{0}=2$. This leaves two physically distinct ways of constructing $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$: (1) there is a single non-Abelian defect in $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$ with quantum dimension $\sqrt{2}$, denoted by $\sigma$, or (2) there are two Abelian defects in $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$, denoted by $\sigma_\pm$ and thus $\sigma_\pm\times\psi=\sigma_\mp$.

Below we will study these two cases in turn. We will find that each case admits four distinct $\mathbb{Z}_2$ extensions $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^\times$, for a total of 8 possible $\mathbb{Z}_2$ extensions of $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$. This reproduces the known result for the classification of fermionic SPT states with unitary on-site $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry, which is known to be

$\mathbb{Z}_8$ [148–151]. In fact, this approach can be further generalized to fermionic SPT phases with an arbitrary finite symmetry group $G$, and the classification is given by three cohomology groups $H^1(G,\mathbb{Z}_2), H^2(G,\mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $H^3(G,\mathrm{U}(1))$ which classifies bosonic SPT phases [152].

### 1. Non-Abelian extensions

We first consider case (1), where there is a single defect type $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g} = \{\sigma\}$. Since we must have $\bar{\sigma} = \sigma$ and the quantum dimensions must satisfy the formula $d_a d_b = \sum_c N_{ab}^c d_c$, there fusion rules for $\sigma$ must be: $\sigma \times \sigma = I + \psi$. We conclude that the extension as a fusion category must be identical to the Ising theory. The $F$-symbols of the Ising category are completely classified, see Eq. (C4). There are two gauge-inequivalent $F$-symbols, distinguished by the Frobenius-Schur indicator $\varkappa_\sigma = \pm 1$.

In this simple case ($G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ with an action that does not permute any topological charges), we can use a symmetry action gauge transformation to pick a gauge in which $\eta_a = 1$. Solving the consistency equations for $G$-crossed braiding, we obtain

$$\begin{gathered} R_\sigma^{\psi\sigma} = i\alpha, R_\sigma^{\sigma\psi} = i\beta \\ R_I^{\sigma\sigma} = \pm\sqrt{\varkappa_\sigma} e^{i\frac{\pi}{8}\alpha}, R_\psi^{\sigma\sigma} = -i\alpha R_I^{\sigma\sigma} \\ U_\mathbf{g}(\sigma,\sigma;I) = U_\mathbf{g}(\sigma,\sigma;\psi) = \alpha\beta \\ U_\mathbf{g}(\psi,\sigma;\sigma) = U_\mathbf{g}(\sigma,\psi;\sigma) = \alpha\beta \\ U_\mathbf{g}(\psi,\psi;I) = 1. \end{gathered} \tag{459}$$

Here, $\alpha^2 = \beta^2 = 1$. Notice that $\beta = +1$ and $-1$ give equivalent solutions under symmetry action gauge transformations, as do the $\pm$ in $R_I^{\sigma\sigma}$. Thus, we find that, for this case, there are four distinct $\mathbb{Z}_2$ extensions, distinguished by $\alpha$ and $\varkappa_\sigma$.

Let us now gauge the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry. The topological charges in $\mathcal{C}/G$ are $(a,\pm)$ where $a = I$, $\psi$, or $\sigma$ and where $\pm$ indicates the trivial and alternating irrep, respectively. Since the mutual braiding phase between $\psi$ and $\sigma$ is $-\alpha\beta$, the topological charge $(\psi, -\alpha\beta)$ has trivial braiding with $(\sigma,\pm)$, since the irrep $\pm$ results in a phase $\pm 1$ when it braids around the defect $\sigma$.

Thus, the four distinct $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ yield four distinct $\mathcal{C}/G$, which we can identify with $\mathrm{Ising}^{(n)} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}$ where $n = 1,3,5,7$. More explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha = 1, \varkappa_\sigma = 1 &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ising}^{(1)} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)} \\ \alpha = 1, \varkappa_\sigma = -1 &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ising}^{(5)} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)} \\ \alpha = -1, \varkappa_\sigma = 1 &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ising}^{(7)} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)} \\ \alpha = -1, \varkappa_\sigma = -1 &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ising}^{(3)} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{460}$$

Physically, all these fermionic phases can be realized in non-interacting spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ superconductors, where the spin up or down fermions form a class D topological superconductor with Chern number $\nu$ or $-\nu$, respectively, where $\nu = 1,3,5,7$. In other words, this is $|\nu|$ copies of $p_x \pm ip_y$ superconductors. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry is the fermion parity of spin up fermions. Gauging the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry results in $\mathrm{Ising}^{(\nu)} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}$, where the $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}$ corresponds to the spin down fermions. We will refer to such a fermionic SPT phase as $(p_x + ip_y)^\nu \times (p_x - ip_y)^\nu$.

### 2. Abelian extensions

We now consider case (2), where there are two Abelian defect types $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g} = \{\sigma_+, \sigma_-\}$. In this case, there are two sets of fusion rules possible: (a) $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ fusion, i.e. $\sigma_+ \times \sigma_+ = I$ or (b) $\mathbb{Z}_4$ fusion, i.e. $\sigma_+ \times \sigma_+ = \psi$.

In case 2(a), the extended theories can be written as products of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}$ with the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ SPT theories, which have been worked out in Sec. X A. This gives two distinct extensions for this case, corresponding to the two $G$-crossed theories $\mathrm{SPT}_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{[\alpha]}$ with $\alpha(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}) = \pm 1$.

In case 2(b), we have $\mathcal{C}_G = \mathrm{Vec}_{\mathbb{Z}_4}$, and we will again find two distinct $\mathbb{Z}_2$ extensions. Explicitly, we relate the topological charges by $I \equiv [0]_4$, $\sigma_+ \equiv [1]_4$, $\psi \equiv [2]_4$, and $\sigma_- \equiv [3]_4$. The $F$-symbols and the $G$-crossed braiding of $\mathrm{Vec}_{\mathbb{Z}_4}$ have been completely solved in Sec. X A. We thus continue using the same notation $p$ to label different 3-cocycles $\alpha$ and $m_a$ which enters the $G$-crossed $R$-symbols, see Eqs. (450) and (451).

However, there are additional constraints now on $p$ and $m_a$ in order to match the $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ sector. Since $F_\psi^{\psi\psi\psi} = 1$, $p$ must be an even integer. In order to match $R_I^{\psi\psi} = -1$, we should have $(-i)^p(-1)^{m_2} = -1$. One more constraint can be obtained by demanding $U_c(a,b;[a+b]_4)$ to only depend on $[c]_2$, which means that $m_a + m_b - m_{a+b}$ is always even. An immediate consequence is that $m_2$ is even, so $p = 2$. In addition, $m_1$ and $m_3$ must have the same parity. Hence in summary we can parameterize $m_{1,2,3}$ as

$$m_a = 2n_a + [a]_2 m', \quad a = 1,2,3. \tag{461}$$

Here $m' = 0$ or 1, while $n_a \in \mathbb{Z}$. The $R$-symbols and $U$-symbols become

$$\begin{aligned} R_{a+b}^{ab} &= e^{-\frac{\pi i}{4}[a]_4[b]_4}(-1)^{n_a b} i^{m'b[a]_2} \\ U_c(a,b;a+b) &= (-1)^{c(n_a+n_b-n_{a+b})} i^{m'([a]_2+[b]_2-[a+b]_2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{462}$$

One can easily see the factor $(-1)^{n_a b}$ in $R_{a+b}^{ab}$ can be removed by a symmetry action gauge transformation. Therefore, as previously mentioned, there are two distinct types of $G$-crossed braiding given by $m' = 0, 1$. From the $R$-symbols, we can compute the topological twists and braiding statistics to be

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{\sigma_+} = R_\psi^{\sigma_+\sigma_+} &= e^{-\frac{\pi i}{4}}(-1)^{n_1} i^{m'} \\ \theta_{\sigma_-} = R_\psi^{\sigma_-\sigma_-} &= e^{-\frac{\pi i}{4}}(-1)^{n_3}(-i)^{m'} \\ R_{\sigma_-}^{\sigma_+\psi} R_{\sigma_-}^{\psi\sigma_+} &= -(-1)^{n_2} \\ R_{\sigma_+}^{\sigma_-\psi} R_{\sigma_+}^{\psi\sigma_-} &= -(-1)^{n_2} \\ R_I^{\sigma_-\sigma_+} R_I^{\sigma_+\sigma_-} &= -i(-1)^{n_1+n_3+m'} \end{aligned} \tag{463}$$

Next, we can gauge the symmetry of these theories. We label the topological charges in $\mathcal{C}/G$ by $(a,\alpha)$ where $a\in\mathbb{Z}_4$ and $\alpha=\pm1$. We can set $n_a=0$ and assume $m'=0$ for simplicity, then all $U$ symbols are 1. The fusion rules of the gauged theory are then simply given by: $(a,\alpha)\times(b,\beta)=([a+b]_4,\alpha\beta)$. We observe that $(2,-)$ has trivial full braiding with all other topological charge types and that we can write the topological charges with $-$ irreps as $(a,-)=([a+2]_4,+)\times(2,-)$. In this manner, we can write the theory as the product $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}\times\mathbb{Z}_4^{(-1/2)}$, where the $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}$ corresponds to the topological charges $\{(0,+),([2],-)\}$ and the $\mathbb{Z}_4^{(-1/2)}$ corresponds to the topological charges $\{(a,+)|\,a=0,1,2,3\}$. For $m'=1$, we similarly obtain the gauged theory $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}\times\mathbb{Z}_4^{(1/2)}$. Thus, we have two distinct gauged theories for case 2(b), one for each distinct $G$-crossed extension.

The $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed extensions discussed here should not be confused with a different concept, which is referred to as a modular extension of fermions. Physically, a modular extension of fermions corresponds to gauging the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry of fermion parity conservation, such that there are no independent (bosonic) $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charges other than the $\psi$ fermions themselves. The extended category in such a modular extension will, by definition, be a modular one and will be braided in the usual sense (as opposed to $G$-crossed braided). In contrast, $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed extensions considered in this section are different, as bosonic $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charges are allowed, and the braiding is $G$-crossed.

In summary, we have found four Abelian $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed extensions of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}$ (one of which is trivial), all of which can be realized again in non-interacting superconductors as $(p+ip)^\nu\times(p-ip)^\nu$ as described previously, but with even Chern number $\nu=0,2,4,6$. We notice that $\nu=0$ is the trivial extension, $\nu=4$ corresponds to taking the product of the trivial fermion theory with a (nontrivial) bosonic $\mathbb{Z}_2$ SPT [153], and the other two are nontrivial fermionic SPT phases [74, 148].

### C. Semions $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(\pm\frac{1}{2})}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry

In this section, we examine the semion theory for $G=\mathbb{Z}_2$. The semion theory $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(\pm\frac{1}{2})}$ consists of only two topological charges $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}=\{I,s\}$, where $s$ is a semion with fusion $s\times s=I$ and topological twist $\theta_s=\pm i$. Such a theory would describe the topological properties of the bosonic $\nu=1/2$ Laughlin FQH state. The nontrivial $F$-symbols and $R$-symbols are $F_s^{sss}=-1$ and $R_I^{s,s}=\pm i$. We will focus on the $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(\frac{1}{2})}$ theory in this section.

Since there is only one nontrivial topological charge type, the symmetry action does not permute topological charge values. As discussed at the end of Sec. III C, this automatically means the obstruction vanishes and we can set $\mathfrak{O}=I$. The symmetry fractionalization is classified by $H^2(\mathbb{Z}_2,\mathbb{Z}_2)=\mathbb{Z}_2$, which gives two equivalence classes corresponding to $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=I$ and $s$, respectively. Physically, these two cohomology classes correspond to whether the semion carries a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge of 0 or $\frac{1}{2}$. The two fractionalization classes correspond to distinct fusion rules for the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ defects, which are, respectively, given by: $\mathbf{g}\times\mathbf{g}=I$ or $\mathbf{g}\times\mathbf{g}=s$. In the following, we focus on the latter case and systematically work out the gauging procedure (although there are other simpler ways to get the gauged theory). We will use a choice of gauge in which $\eta_s(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=1$.

First, we construct the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$ theory. For the nontrivial $H^2(\mathbb{Z}_2,\mathbb{Z}_2)$ class $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=s$, we have $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}=\{\sigma_+,\sigma_-\}$, and $\sigma_+\times\sigma_+=s$. The extended category has the same fusion rules as $\mathrm{Vec}_{\mathbb{Z}_4}$, similar to one of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ extension of fermions discussed in Sec. X B. As such, we again identify $I\equiv[0],s\equiv[2],\sigma_+\equiv[1],\sigma_-\equiv[3]$. The $F$-symbols are given in Eq. (450). In order to match the $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ sector, we must have $\alpha([2],[2],[2])=F_s^{sss}=-1$, and, hence, $p$ must be an odd integer.

The $G$-crossed braiding of $\mathrm{Vec}_{\mathbb{Z}_4}$ were found to be

$$R^{ab}_{[a+b]} = e^{-\frac{\pi ip}{8}[a]_4[b]_4}e^{\frac{2\pi im_a}{4}b}, \tag{464}$$

$$U_c(a,b) = e^{-\frac{\pi ip}{4}c(a+b-[a+b]_4)}e^{\frac{\pi i}{2}c(m_a+m_b-m_{a+b})}. \tag{465}$$

Here $m_a$ are arbitrary integers. The analysis is very similar to the Abelian $\mathbb{Z}_2$ extension of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}$ except that now the $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ sector is different. We will not repeat the steps, but just give the final result: $p=-1$, and

$$m_a=2n_a+[a]_2m',\quad a=1,2,3, \tag{466}$$

where $m'=0$ or 1, and $n_a\in\mathbb{Z}$.

From the $R$-symbols, we can compute the topological twists and braiding statistics

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_+=R_s^{\sigma_+\sigma_+}&=e^{\frac{\pi i}{8}}(-1)^{n_1}i^{m'}\\
\theta_-=R_s^{\sigma_-\sigma_-}&=-e^{\frac{\pi i}{8}}(-1)^{n_3}(-i)^{m'}\\
R_{\sigma_-}^{\sigma_+s}R_{\sigma_-}^{s\sigma_+}&=i(-1)^{m'+n_2}\\
R_{\sigma_+}^{\sigma_-s}R_{\sigma_+}^{s\sigma_-}&=-i(-1)^{m'+n_2}\\
R_I^{\sigma_-\sigma_+}R_I^{\sigma_+\sigma_-}&=e^{\frac{3\pi i}{4}}(-1)^{n_1+n_3}
\end{aligned} \tag{467}$$

The integer $m'$ taking the values 0 or 1 corresponds to two distinct solutions for $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$. This corresponds to the two distinct possible values of $H^3(\mathbb{Z}_2,\mathrm{U}(1))=\mathbb{Z}_2$. Therefore, we find that the distinct $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed extensions of the semion theory are indeed in one-to-one correspondence with the different choices of $H^2(G,\mathcal{A})=\mathbb{Z}_2$ and $H^3(G,\mathrm{U}(1))=\mathbb{Z}_2$.

We now describe the gauged theory. The topological charges in the gauged theory are parameterized by $([a],\alpha)$ where $a\in\mathbb{Z}_4$ and $\alpha=\pm1$ labels the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ irreps (trivial and alternating, respectively). The fusion rules are given by

$$(a,\alpha)\times(b,\beta)=([a+b]_4,\alpha\beta U_\mathbf{g}(a,b)). \tag{468}$$

We can verify that the fusion algebra Eq. (468) is isomorphic to those of a $\mathbb{Z}_8$ theory. For the solution with $m'=0$, the gauged theory is $\mathbb{Z}_8^{(1/2)}$, which is equivalent to a $\mathrm{U}(1)_8$ Chern-Simons theory. For $m'=1$, the gauged theory is $\mathbb{Z}_8^{(5/2)}$. The original semion theory can then be obtained from these gauged theories by condensing the bosonic quasiparticle $[4]_8$ in the $\mathbb{Z}_8$ theories.

Physically, the nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed extension of the semion model with $m' = 0$ can be constructed by starting from a Kalmeyer-Laughlin chiral spin liquid with $\mathrm{U}(1)$ $S_z$ rotational symmetry [154], where the semions carry half $\mathrm{U}(1)$ charges, and then breaking the $\mathrm{U}(1)$ down to a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup to obtain a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry-enriched semion theory.

### D. Semions $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(\pm\frac{1}{2})}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry

We consider the semion theory $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}} = \{I, s\}$ with symmetry group $G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \equiv \{\mathbb{1}, X, Y, Z\}$. Again because there is no permutation, the obstruction $\mathfrak{O}$ is identically $I$. The symmetry fractionalization classes are given by $H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2^3$. Among the 7 nontrivial 2nd cohomology classes, three are just the nontrivial cocycle in $H^2(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ for the three $\mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroups, which has been considered in the previous section. Thus, we will focus on other four cohomology classes, which are distinguished by $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}), \mathbf{g} = X, Y, Z$ subject to the constraint $\mathfrak{w}(X, X)\mathfrak{w}(Y, Y)\mathfrak{w}(Z, Z) = s$.

#### 1. $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}) = s, \forall \mathbf{g} \neq \mathbb{1}$

First we consider the case where the 2-cocycle $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}) = s$ for $\mathbf{g} = X, Y, Z$. The extended theory has $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}} = \{\sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^+, \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^-\}$ where $\mathbf{g} = X, Y, Z$ and $\sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^\pm = s \times \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^\mp$. The fusion rules of the extended theory can be easily obtained from the 2-cocycles:

$$\begin{gathered} \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^+ \times \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^+ = \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^- \times \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^- = s \\ \sigma_X^+ \times \sigma_Y^+ = \sigma_Z^+, \sigma_Y^+ \times \sigma_X^+ = \sigma_Z^- \end{gathered} \tag{469}$$

The other fusion rules can be obtained by cyclic permutation combined with the relation between $\sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^+$ and $\sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^-$. We notice that the fusion rules match exactly with the multiplication table of the quaternion group $\mathbb{Q}_8$. In other words, $\mathcal{C}_G \simeq \mathrm{Vec}_{\mathbb{Q}_8}$. The $F$-symbols are then classified by $H^3(\mathbb{Q}_8, \mathrm{U}(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_8$. Four of them can match the $F$-symbols of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{1}}$.

In order to make sense of $G$-crossed braiding, we need to extend the symmetry action onto the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ sector. For example, we must have

$$X : \sigma_X^\pm \to \sigma_X^\pm, \sigma_Y^\pm \to \sigma_Y^\mp, \sigma_Z^\pm \to \sigma_Z^\mp. \tag{470}$$

The action of $Y$ and $Z$ can be obtained by cyclic permutations. We have checked that the $G$-crossed hexagon equations have solutions with the help of Mathematica. Interestingly, we can set all the $\eta_a(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h})$ to 1 except $a = s$ and $\eta_s$ is a nontrivial 2-cocycle in $H^2(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$, which is the expected result.

Let us now consider the gauged theory. With the symmetry action given in Eq. (470), for $\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbb{1}$ each $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ forms an orbit under $G$. For $\mathbf{g} = X, Y, Z$, the stabilizer group of the orbit $\{\sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^+, \sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^-\}$ is the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup generated by $\mathbf{g}$. So we get $3 \times 2 = 6$ anyons with quantum dimension $d = 2$. Their topological twists can be computed from the $G$-crossed $R$-symbols, and all of them have $\pm e^{i\frac{\pi}{8}}$ twist factor. For the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{1}}$ sector, the stabilizer group is the whole $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. The vacuum simply splits according to the linear irreducible representations of $G$, which gives four $d = 1$ Abelian anyons. However, the semion carries a projective representation of $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, since the factor set $\eta_s$ belongs to the nontrivial cohomology class in $H^2(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2, \mathrm{U}(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$. It is well-known that there is a unique two-dimensional irreducible representation with this factor set $\eta_s$ up to similarity, essentially given by Pauli matrices. According to Sec. VIII B, this implies that the semion becomes a $d = 2$ non-Abelian quasiparticle in the gauged theory with the topological twist still being $i$. Therefore, we find there are 7 non-Abelian anyons with $d = 2$ and four Abelian ones, for a total of 11 anyons.

Another way to obtain the number of anyons is to compute the ground state degeneracy of the gauged theory on the torus, as described in Sec. VIII D. To do this, note that the system can have twisted sectors with group elements in $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. This implies 1 untwisted sector and 15 twisted sectors. The untwisted sector has two invariant states. The twisted sectors can be understood as follows. There are 3 twisted sectors where there is a twist only along the longitudinal cycle and no twist along the meridian. In each such twisted sector in $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, there are 2 states. However from the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ action it is easy to see that only one state is invariant under the symmetry and survives the gauging. Therefore, the sectors with twists only along the longitudinal and not the meridian yields 3 states, and similarly for sectors with twists only along the meridian and not the longitudinal cycles. For sectors with twists along both cycles, it can be easily verified that the sectors $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h})$ with $\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{h}$ contain no states, while sectors of the form $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g})$ contain one state. Therefore the twisted sectors in total yield 9 states. Combined with the untwisted sector, we find a torus degeneracy of 11 for the gauged theory. This implies that there are 11 distinct quasiparticles, as explained above.

One can obtain the fusion rules of the gauged theory using the solutions of the $G$-crossed consistency equations, but we choose to use a different method, namely gauging the symmetry sequentially. Without loss of generality, we first gauge the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup $\{\mathbb{1}, Z\}$. Since $\mathfrak{w}(Z, Z) = s$, from the previous subsection we have learnt that gauging this subgroup results in a $\mathrm{U}(1)_8$ theory. The other $\mathbb{Z}_2$ group then has a nontrivial action in the $\mathrm{U}(1)_8$ theory, namely it acts as a charge conjugation symmetry. We will discuss the charge conjugation symmetry in $\mathrm{U}(1)_8$ theory in more detail in Section X F. Here we note that the gauged theory can be understood in terms of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ orbifold of a $\mathrm{U}(1)_8$ CFT, which was analyzed in Ref. [100]. Interestingly, it can also be understood as the $\mathbb{D}_2 \equiv \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ orbifold of the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_1$ CFT, which fits naturally within our approach. The gauged theory can be identified with $\overline{\mathrm{SO}(8)}_2$.

To have a physical realization of the semion theory with this $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry, one can start from a chiral spin liquid in spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ systems, which has $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ spin rotational symmetry. The semion carries spin-$1/2$, i.e. a projective representation of the $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ symmetry. One can then break the $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ symmetry down to the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup, i.e. $\pi$ rotations around three orthogonal axes. We can explicitly write down the local unitary operators on a semion:

$$U_X = i\sigma_x, U_Y = i\sigma_y, U_Z = i\sigma_z. \tag{471}$$

Apparently $U_{\mathbf{g}}^2 = -1$ so $e^{i\phi_s(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})} = -1$. This is the familiar fact that spin-$1/2$ acquires a $\pi$ phase after a $2\pi$ rotation.

#### 2. *Other cocycles and obstruction to defining $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$*

We now turn to the other three cocycles, which has two $s$ and one $I$ among $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}), \mathbf{g} = X, Y, Z$. Without loss of generality we consider $\mathfrak{w}(X,X) = \mathfrak{w}(Y,Y) = I, \mathfrak{w}(Z,Z) = s$. The fusion rules of the defects can be worked out as before:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_X^\pm \times \sigma_X^\pm = \sigma_Y^\pm \times \sigma_Y^\pm = I, \sigma_Z^\pm \times \sigma_Z^\pm = s \\ \sigma_X^+ \times \sigma_Y^+ = \sigma_Z^+, \sigma_Y^+ \times \sigma_X^+ = \sigma_Z^- \\ \sigma_Y^+ \times \sigma_Z^+ = \sigma_X^-, \sigma_Z^+ \times \sigma_Y^+ = \sigma_Z^+ \\ \sigma_Z^+ \times \sigma_X^+ = \sigma_Y^-, \sigma_X^+ \times \sigma_Z^+ = \sigma_Y^+ \end{aligned} \tag{472}$$

The other fusion rules can be obtained using the relation between $\sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^+$ and $\sigma_{\mathbf{g}}^-$. With these fusion rules, we see that $\mathcal{C}_G \simeq \mathrm{Vec}_{\mathbb{D}_8}$. Here $\mathbb{D}_8 = \mathbb{Z}_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ is the dihedral group of order 8. The $F$-symbols are classified by $H^3(\mathbb{D}_8, \mathrm{U}(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$. Among the 16 classes, 8 of them can match the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ sector.

Therefore, the extended category as a usual fusion category does exist. However, we find that the $G$-crossed consistency equations admit no solutions. Therefore the extended category has no $G$-crossed braiding. This implies that the symmetry action can not be consistently extended to the whole $\mathcal{C}_G$ and therefore we cannot continue our gauging procedure. In other words, there is an obstruction to gauging the symmetry. This is in full agreement with the result obtained in Ref. [92] using a different method. The physical meaning of this is that the semion theory with such a symmetry fractionalization class cannot exist in 2+1 dimensions, but could possibly exist at the surface of a 3+1 dimensional system, as discussed in Ref. [92].

### E. $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)}$ Anyons with $N$ odd and $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry

In this subsection we consider $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry in the $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)}$ anyon model where $N$ is odd and $p$ is integer. $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)}$ has $N$ distinct topological charges, labeled by $a = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1$. The fusion rules are just given by addition modulo $N$: $a \times b = [a+b]_N$. The $F$-symbols are all trivial and the $R$-symbols are given by

$$R^{ab}_{[a+b]_N} = e^{\frac{2\pi i p a b}{N}}. \tag{473}$$

Physically, these models show up in the mathematical description of $\nu = \frac{1}{m}$ Laughlin FQH states with $m$ odd, which have the same topological order as $\mathbb{Z}_m^{(2)} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}$. These theories have a $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)}) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ topological symmetry associated with charge-conjugation, which is given by the action $[a] \to [-a]$ [12, 155]. A twist defect associated with the permutation of quasiparticles into quasiholes can be engineered in the Laughlin state by creating a superconducting trench in the bulk, or as a superconducting/magnetic domain wall on the edge of a fractional topological insulator [9–12].

We have two choices for the map $\rho : \mathbb{Z}_2 \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)})$. It can either map both elements of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ to the identity element of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)})$, or it can map the non-trivial element of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ to the non-trivial element of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)})$. Here we will consider the latter case.

First we calculate the symmetry fractionalization classes $H^2_\rho(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_N)$. The cocycle condition simplifies to

$${}^{\mathbf{g}}\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}) = \mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}). \tag{474}$$

Therefore $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})$ must be a $\mathbf{g}$-invariant charge. In fact, this holds for any $\mathbf{g}$ of order 2, i.e. $\mathbf{g}^2 = \mathbf{0}$. Since $N$ is odd, there is no fixed point under the $G$ action, hence $H^2_\rho(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_N) = 0$.

As discussed in Sec. VII B, since there are no $\mathbf{g}$-invariant topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$, we have $|\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}| = 1$. In other words, there is exactly one type of defect, which will be denoted by $\sigma$. We can also prove this statement directly from associativity of the fusion rules without using modularity. If there is another defect $\sigma'$, it must be related to $\sigma$ by fusing with some $a \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}} \equiv \mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)}$. Assume $\sigma' = \sigma \times a$. When $a$ is taken around the defect it becomes $[-a]_N$, which implies that $\sigma \times a = \sigma \times [-a]_N = \sigma'$. We then conclude $\sigma' \times a = \sigma' \times [-a]_N = \sigma$ and thus $\sigma \times a^2 = \sigma$. Using this relation, we calculate $\sigma' = \sigma \times [-a]_N$ again to be

$$\sigma \times [-a]_N = \sigma \times \underbrace{a^2 \times a^2 \times \cdots a^2}_{\frac{N-1}{2}} = (\sigma \times a^2) \times \cdots a^2 = \sigma, \tag{475}$$

which proves $\sigma' = \sigma$.

The fusion rules of $\sigma$ can be easily obtained to be

$$\sigma \times a = a \times \sigma = \sigma \tag{476}$$

$$\sigma \times \sigma = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{C}_0} a. \tag{477}$$

The fusion category $\mathcal{C}_G = \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}} \oplus \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ is known as the Tambara-Yamagami category [156]. The $F$-symbols of $\mathcal{C}_G$ are completely classified in Ref. [156] and are given by the $F$-symbols of the original category $\mathcal{C}_0$, together with:

$$\begin{aligned} [F_\sigma^{a\sigma b}]_{\sigma\sigma} = [F_b^{\sigma a \sigma}]_{\sigma\sigma} = \chi(a,b), \\ [F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{ab} = \frac{\varkappa_\sigma}{\sqrt{N}} \chi^{-1}(a,b), \end{aligned} \tag{478}$$

Here $\chi$ is a $\mathrm{U}(1)$-valued function on $\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_N$, satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(a,b) = \chi(b,a) \\ \chi(ab,c) = \chi(a,b)\chi(b,c), \\ \chi(a,bc) = \chi(a,b)\chi(a,c), \end{aligned} \tag{479}$$

together with normalization condition $\chi(0,a) = \chi(a,0) = 1$. Such a $\chi$ is called a symmetric bi-character. $\varkappa_\sigma = \pm 1$ is the Frobenius-Schur indicator of the $\mathbf{g}$ defect. It is worth mentioning that the two solutions of $F$-symbols distinguished by $\varkappa_\sigma$ is directly related to $H^3(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathrm{U}(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$. Interestingly, this fusion category $\mathcal{C}_G$ does not admit braiding in the usual sense.

We now consider $G$-crossed braiding. First we gauge fix $\eta$. It is easy to see that using symmetry-action gauge transformations we can set $\eta_\sigma(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})$ all to 1. For $\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})$, they transform under the symmetry-action gauge transformations as follows:

$$\check{\eta}_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}) = \gamma_{[-a]}(\mathbf{g})\gamma_a(\mathbf{g})\eta_e(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}) \tag{480}$$

In addition, the associavitity constraint on $\eta$ yields

$$\eta_{[-a]}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}) = \eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g}). \tag{481}$$

Therefore we can also choose $\gamma_a(\mathbf{g})$ and $\gamma_{[-a]}(\mathbf{g})$ to set all $\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})$ to 1. We notice that the remaining symmetry-based gauge transformations are $\gamma_\sigma(\mathbf{g})$ being $\pm 1$.

With this gauge fixing, we find the following solutions to the $G$-crossed braiding consistency equations:

$$\begin{gathered}\chi(a,b) = R^{ab}_{a+b} = e^{\frac{2\pi i pab}{N}},\\ R^{\sigma a}_{\sigma} = s(a)(-1)^{pa}e^{-\frac{\pi i p a^2}{N}}, R^{a\sigma}_{\sigma} = (-1)^{pa}e^{-\frac{\pi i p a^2}{N}}\\ R^{\sigma\sigma}_{a} = \gamma(-1)^{pa}e^{\frac{\pi i p a^2}{N}}\\ \gamma^2 = \frac{\varkappa_\sigma}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1}(-1)^{pn}e^{-\frac{\pi i p n^2}{N}}.\end{gathered} \tag{482}$$

We have chosen $\eta \equiv 1$, which is possible since $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$. Here $s(a) \equiv U_{\mathbf{g}}(\sigma,\sigma,a) = \pm 1$ is an arbitrary sign with a constraint $s(a) = s(-a)$. We notice that none of the $U_{\mathbf{g}}$ are intrinsic in the sense that they are all essentially maps between different splitting spaces, except $U_{\mathbf{g}}(\sigma,\sigma;0) = 1$.

Having obtained the $R$-symbols, we can formally calculate the topological spin:

$$\theta_\sigma = \sum_a \frac{d_a}{d_\sigma} R^{\sigma\sigma}_a = \gamma^*. \tag{483}$$

We can also calculate the $G$-crossed modular matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S} &= \left[\begin{array}{c|ccc} S_{\mathbf{0}} & 0 & 0 & 0\\ \hline 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma^2 e^{\frac{\pi i}{4}c_-}\end{array}\right],\\ \mathcal{T} &= \left[\begin{array}{c|ccc} T_{\mathbf{0}} & 0 & 0 & 0\\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma^*\\ 0 & 0 & \gamma^* & 0\end{array}\right].\end{aligned} \tag{484}$$

Here $S_{\mathbf{0}}, T_{\mathbf{0}}$ are the topological $S$ and $T$ matrices for the $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)}$ theory. The basis states of the twisted sectors are chosen to be $|0^{(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{g})}\rangle, |\sigma^{(\mathbf{g},0)}\rangle, |\sigma^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})}\rangle$ (in this order). It is straightforward to check that $\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}$ form a representation of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$.

We now proceed to derive the properties of the gauged theory $\mathcal{C}/G$. Under the group action the extended category is divided into $\frac{N+1}{2}$ orbits: $[0], \{[a],[-a]\}, \sigma$. The stabilizer subgroups are $\mathbb{Z}_2$ for $[0]$ and $\sigma$, and trivial for the $\frac{N-1}{2}$ orbits $\{[a],[-a]\}$. Therefore the vacuum should split into a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ even charge $([0],+) \equiv I$ (i.e. the vacuum in $\mathcal{C}/G$) and a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ odd charge $([0],-) \equiv e$ (i.e. the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge) which satisfies $e^2 = I$. The orbits $\{[a],[-a]\}, 1 \le a \le \frac{N-1}{2}$ become $\frac{N-1}{2}$ non-Abelian anyons with $d = 2$, which we label by $\phi_a$. Their fusion rules are given by:

$$\phi_a \times \phi_b = \begin{cases}\phi_{\min(a+b,N-a-b)} + \phi_{|a-b|} & a \neq b\\ I + e + \phi_{\min(2a,N-2a)} & a = b\end{cases} \tag{485}$$

We turn to the defect sectors. As we have argued, there is one defect in the extended theory, which should split into two $(\sigma,\pm)$ in $\mathcal{C}/G$. They have the same quantum dimensions $\sqrt{N}$. Their fusion rules are

$$\begin{aligned}(\sigma,+)\times(\sigma,+) &= I + \sum_a \phi_a,\\ (\sigma,+)\times(\sigma,-) &= e + \sum_a \phi_a.\end{aligned} \tag{486}$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{C}/G$ has $2 + \frac{N-1}{2} + 2 = \frac{N+7}{2}$ topological charges.

To further identify the gauged theory, we calculate the topological twists. The twist factors of $\phi_a$ are identical to $a$ (or $[-a]_N$), so we have $\theta_{\phi_a} = e^{\frac{2\pi i p a^2}{N}}$. We find that when $p = \frac{N-1}{2}$, i.e. $\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathrm{SU}(N)_1$, the gauged theory is equivalent to the $\mathrm{SO}(N)_2$ category. We can confirm this by computing the twist factor of the defects. The Gauss sum in the expression of $\gamma^2$ evaluates to $e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{8}(N-1)}$ and we obtain $\theta_\sigma^2 = (\gamma^*)^2 = \kappa i^{\frac{N-1}{2}}$, consistent with $\mathrm{SO}(N)_2$ when $\kappa = 1$. The gauged theories for $\kappa = -1$ as well as the other $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)}$ are Galois conjugates of $\mathrm{SO}(N)_2$.

We note that the relation between the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ theory and the gauged theory $\mathrm{SO}(3)_2 = \mathrm{SU}(2)_4$ was previously observed in Refs. [75, 102, 157].

### F. $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p+\frac{1}{2})}$ Anyons with $N$ even and $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry

Here we consider $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry in the $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p+\frac{1}{2})}$ anyon model where $N$ is even and $p$ is integer. This model has $N$ topological charges labeled by $a = 0,\dots,N-1$ whose fusion rule is again given by addition mod $N$. The $F$-symbols and $R$-symbols are given by

$$\begin{aligned}F^{abc}_{a+b+c} &= e^{i\frac{\pi}{N}a([b]+[c]-[b+c])},\\ R^{ab}_{a+b} &= e^{\frac{2\pi i}{N}(p+\frac{1}{2})[a][b]}.\end{aligned} \tag{487}$$

$p = 0$ represents the topological order of the well-known $\mathrm{U}(1)_N$ Chern-Simons theory, which describes the bosonic $\nu = 1/N$ Laughlin FQH states.

This theory has a topological symmetry $\mathrm{Aut}\big(\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p+\frac{1}{2})}\big) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ associated with charge conjugation, which is given by the action $[a] \to [-a]$. As in the previous section, we consider the case where the $\rho : \mathbb{Z}_2 \to \mathrm{Aut}\big(\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p+\frac{1}{2})}\big)$ maps the non-trivial element in the symmetry group $\mathbb{Z}_2$ to the non-trivial element of $\mathrm{Aut}\big(\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p+\frac{1}{2})}\big)$. Because $N$ is even, the anyon $\frac{N}{2}$ is a fixed point under $\mathbf{g}$. This implies that the second cohomology group

$H^2_\rho(\mathbb{Z}_2,\mathbb{Z}_N)=\mathbb{Z}_2$ when $N$ is even. To see this, note that the cocycle condition has a solution $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=[N/2]$. Since a coboundary is always ${}^{\mathbf{g}}a\times a=[0]$, this solution indeed represents a nontrivial cohomology class.

Due to the existence of one $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant anyon in $\mathcal{C}_0\equiv\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p+\frac{1}{2})}$, there are two species of twist defects, labeled by $\sigma_\pm$. Their fusion rules are

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_+\times\sigma_+&=\sum_{a\text{ even}}[a]_N\\ \sigma_+\times\sigma_-&=\sum_{a\text{ odd}}[a]_N\\ \sigma_\pm\times[a]_N&=\begin{cases}\sigma_\pm & a\text{ even}\\ \sigma_\mp & a\text{ odd}\end{cases}\end{aligned}\tag{488}$$

The quantum dimensions of the defects are $d_{\sigma_\pm}=\sqrt{\frac{N}{2}}$.

Let us first consider $N=2m$ where $m$ is an odd integer. We have a decomposition $\mathbb{Z}_{2m}^{(p+\frac{1}{2})}=\mathbb{Z}_m^{(2p+1)}\times\mathbb{Z}_2^{(mp+\frac{m}{2})}$. The mapping is given by

$$[a]_{2m}\leftrightarrow\left(\left[\frac{a+m[a]_2}{2}\right]_m,[a]_2\right).\tag{489}$$

We can easily see that the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action induces the charge conjugation symmetry on the $\mathbb{Z}_m$ theory. The anyon $[m]_{2m}$ is actually a semion, and the symmetry fractionalization classes $H^2(\mathbb{Z}_2,\mathbb{Z}_N)=\mathbb{Z}_2$ only affect the semion theory, which was considered in Sec. X C.

Next we consider a simple but nontrivial example with $N=4$. The nontrivial cocyle $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=[2]$. By solving the pentagon equations for $\mathcal{C}_G$, we find there are four gauge-inequivalent solutions [158], distinguished by the Frobenius-Schur indicators of the defects: $\varkappa_{\sigma_+}=\pm1,\varkappa_{\sigma_-}=\pm1$. This should be contrasted with the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-extended toric code discussed in the next subsection, where similarly there are two types of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ defects, but with identical Frobenius-Schur indicators. In fact, the appearance of solutions where $\sigma_\pm$ have different Frobenius-Schur indicator is closely related to the existence of a nontrivial 2-cocycle in $H^2_\rho(\mathbb{Z}_2,\mathbb{Z}_4)$.

Physically, the nontrivial 2-cocycle implies that both $[1]$ and $[3]$ carry a "half" $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge, while being permuted under the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action. To see this explicitly, we can calculate the symmetry fractionalization phases $\eta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})$. The cocycle condition implies $\eta_{[1]}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=\eta_{[3]}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})$. We also have

$$\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})\eta_a^{-1}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})\tag{490}$$

being a character on $\mathbb{Z}_4$, so $\omega_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=e^{\frac{i\pi}{2}an}$ where $n\in\mathbb{Z}_4$. See the discussions around Eq. (153) for more details. By directly solving the $F$-symbol invariance condition Eq. (87), we find $\beta_{[1]}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=\beta_{[3]}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=1,\beta_{[2]}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=-1$. These together implies $n=0$ or $n=2$. Apparently $n=2$ is the nontrivial solution, with $\eta_{[1]}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=\eta_{[3]}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=-1$. This confirms that $[1]$ and $[3]$ indeed carry half $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charges.

Since $\sigma_+\times[1]=\sigma_+\times[3]=\sigma_-$, one expects that either $\sigma_+$ or $\sigma_-$ has to carry a half $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge, while the other has a trivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge. The half $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge changes the Frobenius-Schur indicator of one of the two defects. In addition to this, we can change the $F$-symbols by a nontrivial 3-cocycle in $H^3(\mathbb{Z}_2,\mathrm{U}(1))$, which actually amounts to gluing a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ SPT state, changing their Frobenius-Schur indicators simultaneously. However, the solutions with $\varkappa_{\sigma_\pm}=\pm1$ and the one with $\varkappa_{\sigma_\pm}=\mp1$ are clearly related by relabeling the two defects. Therefore, allowing relabeling defects reduces the number of distinct solutions solutions from four to three.

After gauging, we find that the solution $(\kappa_{\sigma_+},\kappa_{\sigma_-})=(1,1)$ becomes Ising×Ising, and the solution $(\kappa_{\sigma_+},\kappa_{\sigma_-})=(-1,-1)$ becomes $\text{Ising}^{(5)}\times\overline{\text{Ising}}^{(3)}$. The other two solutions collapse to $\text{Ising}^{(3)}\times\overline{\text{Ising}}^{(1)}$.

### G. $\mathbb{Z}_N$-Toric Code $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z}_N)$ with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry

The anyon model $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z}_N)$ arises as the quantum double of $\mathbb{Z}_N$ [159]. Physically they can be realized by $\mathbb{Z}_N$ generalizations of Kitaev's toric code model, or as $\mathbb{Z}_N$ lattice gauge theories. The anyons are gauge charges (the unit of which is denoted by $e$), gauge fluxes (the unit of which is denoted by $m$) and their bound states, the dyons. So there are $N^2$ anyon labels $a=(a_1,a_2)\equiv e^{a_1}m^{a_2},a_1,a_2=0,1,\dots,N-1$, with $e\equiv(1,0),m\equiv(0,1)$. Their fusion rules are straithforward: $(a_1,a_2)\times(b_1,b_2)=([a_1+a_2]_N,[b_1+b_2]_N)$, i.e. they form a $\mathbb{Z}_N\times\mathbb{Z}_N$ fusion algebra. The $F$-symbols of the theory are all trivial and the $R$-symbols are given by $R^{a,b}=e^{\frac{2\pi i}{N}a_2b_1}$.

$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z}_N))$ is generally a complicated group. Besides the trivial action, we can easily identify two $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetries: (1) $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(e)=m,\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(m)=e$. This is known as the electric-magnetic duality symmetry, and can be realized in a slightly different formulation of the toric code model by Wen [160] as lattice translations [4, 7]. Alternatively, one can also realize this type of symmetry of a $\mathbb{Z}_N$ toric code in an on-site fashion [161]. (2) $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(e)=e^{N-1},\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(m)=m^{N-1}$, this is sort of a charge conjugation symmetry. In this section we consider the trivial action and the electric-magnetic duality symmetry.

We first calculate the symmetry fractionalization class. Since the $F$ symbols of $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z}_N)$ are all trivial, the obstruction can be set to $I$ identically. The Abelian anyons form a group $\mathbb{Z}_N\times\mathbb{Z}_N$. (1) The action on the charge label set $\rho$ is trivial. We generally have $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=e^{n_1}m^{n_2}$. It is easy to see that when $N$ is odd, this is a coboundary $\mathfrak{w}=\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{z}$ where $\mathfrak{z}(\mathbf{g})=e^{2^{-1}n_1}m^{2^{-1}n_2}$, with $2^{-1}$ being the inverse of 2 in $\mathbb{Z}_N$. For even $N$, if either of $n_1,n_2$ is odd, it is a nontrivial cocycle. (2) The action on the charge label set is the electric-magnetic duality symmetry. As we have shown in Eq. (474), $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})$ must be a $\mathbf{g}$-invariant anyon, so $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=e^nm^n$ where $n=0,1,\dots,N-1$. However, this is a coboundary since $e^nm^n=\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(e^n)\times e^n$. Therefore we have shown that $H^2_\rho(\mathbb{Z}_2,\mathbb{Z}_N\times\mathbb{Z}_N)=0$.

### 1. Trivial action

We now consider the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ toric code with trivial symmetry action on the label set. We denote the four anyons by $I, e, m, \psi$ where $\psi = e \times m$. Using our previous labeling, $e = (1, 0), m = (0, 1)$ and $\psi = (1, 1)$. There are four fractionalization classes, given by $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}) = I, e, m, \psi$.

There are four defects which are labeled by $\sigma_I, \sigma_e, \sigma_m, \sigma_\psi$ where $\sigma_a = \sigma_I \times a$ for $a = e, m, \psi$. They all satisfy $\sigma_a^2 = \mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g})$.

We will not show the complete set of $G$-crossed braided data of the extended category, but just give the $G$-crossed invariants $\mathcal{T}^2$ (with all $\eta$ set to 1). For $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}) = m$, we find

$$\theta^2_{\sigma_I} = \theta^2_{\sigma_m} = (-1)^p, \theta^2_{\sigma_e} = \theta^2_{\sigma_\psi} = -(-1)^p. \tag{491}$$

Here $p = 0, 1$. We notice that the two solutions are related by gluing a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ SPT state. For $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}) = \psi$, we have

$$\theta^2_{\sigma_I} = \theta^2_{\sigma_m} = i(-1)^p, \theta^2_{\sigma_e} = \theta^2_{\sigma_\psi} = -i(-1)^p. \tag{492}$$

However, we must keep in mind that the topological charge labels of the defects are arbitrary. For example, which of the defect is defined as $\sigma_I$ is an arbitrary choice. We can redefine $\sigma'_I = \sigma_e, \sigma'_e = \sigma_I, \sigma'_m = \sigma_\psi, \sigma'_\psi = \sigma_m$ and the two solutions become identical. In other words, gluing a nontrivial $H^3(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathrm{U}(1))$ solution does not give distinct $G$-crossed extensions for the three nontrivial fractionalization classes. This phenomena was observed in Refs. [52, 140] using a Chern-Simons field theory approach.

### 2. Electric-magnetic duality symmetry

To understand the extended category and the gauged theory, we notice that for $N$ odd we have the following decomposition of $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z}_N)$: $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z}_N) = \mathbb{Z}_N^{(1)} \times \mathbb{Z}_N^{(-1)}$. To make it explicit, the $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(\pm 1)}$ subcategory are formed by $(k, \pm k), k = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1$. In the decomposition, the symmetry only acts on the $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(-1)}$ sector and the extension problem has been thouroughly analyzed in the previous subection. Therefore the gauged theory is $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(1)} \times (\mathbb{Z}_N^{(-1)}/\mathbb{Z}_2)$. Similar results have been obtained previously in Ref. [103].

For even $N$, such a decomposition no longer exists. Let us consider $N = 2$ as an illustrating example [17, 52, 103]. Because $\psi$ is a fixed point under the $G$ action, there are two species of twist defects labeled by $\sigma_+$ and $\sigma_-$. They differ by fusion with an $e$ or $m$ anyon:

$$\begin{gathered} \sigma_+ \times \sigma_+ = \sigma_- \times \sigma_- = I + \psi \\ \sigma_+ \times \sigma_- = e + m \\ \sigma_+ \times e = \sigma_+ \times m = \sigma_-. \end{gathered} \tag{493}$$

The $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action can be straightforwardly extended to defects: $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(\sigma_\pm) = \sigma_\pm$.

The $F$-symbols of the extended category can be found:

$$F_\sigma^{a\sigma b} = F_b^{\sigma a \sigma} = (-1)^{a_1 b_1}, [F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{ab} = \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{2}}(-1)^{a_1 b_1}. \tag{494}$$

We then solve for the $R$-symbols from the $G$-crossed consistency equations. Similar to the gauge fixing done in Sec. X E, we can set all $\eta$ to 1 and solve the $G$-crossed heptagon equations to get

$$\begin{gathered} R^{\sigma_-, a} = (-1)^{a_1} R^{\sigma_+, a}, R^{\sigma_+, a} = s_a i^{a_1} \\ R^{a, \sigma_-} = R^{a, \sigma_+}, R^{a, \sigma_+} R^{\mathbf{g} a, \sigma_+} = (-1)^{a_1 a_2} \\ R_I^{\sigma_+, \sigma_+} = s_+ \sqrt{\kappa} e^{i s_\psi \frac{\pi}{8}}, R_I^{\sigma_-, \sigma_-} = s_- \sqrt{\kappa} e^{-i s_\psi \frac{\pi}{8}} \\ R_\psi^{\sigma_+, \sigma_+} = s_+ \sqrt{\kappa} e^{-i s_\psi \frac{3\pi}{8}}, R_\psi^{\sigma_-, \sigma_-} = s_- \sqrt{\kappa} e^{i s_\psi \frac{3\pi}{8}} \\ R_e^{\sigma_+, \sigma_-} = -i s_e R_I^{\sigma_+, \sigma_+}, R_m^{\sigma_+, \sigma_-} = s_m R_I^{\sigma_+, \sigma_+} \\ R_e^{\sigma_-, \sigma_+} = i s_e R_I^{\sigma_-, \sigma_-}, R_m^{\sigma_-, \sigma_+} = s_m R_I^{\sigma_-, \sigma_-} \end{gathered} \tag{495}$$

Here $s_a$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ character on the fusion group, i.e. $s_a s_b = s_{ab}$, and $s_\pm = \pm 1$. Notice that $(R^{\psi\sigma_+})^2 = -1$, so $R_{\sigma_+}^{\psi\sigma_+} = s'_\psi i$ where $s'_\psi = \pm 1$. Notice that $s_\pm$ and $s'_\psi$ are all symmetry action gauge degrees of freedoms.

We also find all the $U$ symbols which are invariant under vertex-based gauge transformations:

$$\begin{gathered} U_{\mathbf{g}}(\sigma_+, \sigma_+; I) = 1, U_{\mathbf{g}}(\sigma_+, \sigma_+, \psi) = s_\psi s'_\psi \\ U_{\mathbf{g}}(\sigma_-, \sigma_-; I) = 1, U_{\mathbf{g}}(\sigma_-, \sigma_-, \psi) = -s_\psi s'_\psi \\ U_{\mathbf{g}}(\sigma_+, \psi, \sigma_+) = U_{\mathbf{g}}(\psi, \sigma_+, \sigma_+) = s_\psi s'_\psi \\ U_{\mathbf{g}}(\sigma_-, \psi, \sigma_-) = U_{\mathbf{g}}(\psi, \sigma_-, \sigma_-) = -s_\psi s'_\psi \\ U_{\mathbf{g}}(\psi, \psi; I) = 1 \end{gathered} \tag{496}$$

We can recognize that two subcategories $\{I, \psi, \sigma_+\}$ and $\{I, \psi, \sigma_-\}$ closely resemble the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed braided Ising category discussed in Section X B. The topological twists of the defects are given by

$$\theta_{\sigma_\pm} = s_\pm \sqrt{\kappa} e^{\pm i s_\psi \frac{\pi}{8}}. \tag{497}$$

So the two Ising subcategories are conjugate to each other and thus flipping the value of $s_\psi = \pm 1$ is equivalent to relabeling $\sigma_+$ and $\sigma_-$, and the same is true for the remaining sign ambiguity $s_e$. Therefore, we have found that there are two gauge-inequivalent $G$-crossed extensions labeled by $\kappa = \pm 1$. In the following we set $s'_\psi = s_\pm = 1$.

The $G$-crossed modular $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ matrices are given by:

$$\mathcal{S} = \left[\begin{array}{c|ccc|cc|cc} S_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{s_\psi}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{s_\psi}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{s_\psi}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{s_\psi}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \kappa \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \kappa & 0 \end{array}\right],$$

$$\mathcal{T} = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc|cc|cc} T_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \kappa^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{i\pi}{8}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \kappa^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}} \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & \kappa^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{i\pi}{8}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \kappa^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}} & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]. \tag{498}$$

Here the basis states for the twisted sectors are chosen to be $|I^{(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{g})}\rangle, |\psi^{(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{g})}\rangle, |\sigma_+^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0})}\rangle, |\sigma_-^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{0})}\rangle, |\sigma_+^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})}\rangle, |\sigma_-^{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})}\rangle$.

Now let us consider the gauged theory. There are nine topological charges, labeled by $(I,s),(\psi,s),(\sigma_\pm,s),Y$ where $s=\pm 1$ and $Y$ corresponds to the orbit $\{e,m\}$ so $d_Y=2$. A straightforward application of Eq. (407) yields the following fusion rules:

$$\begin{gathered} (\psi,s)\times(\sigma_+,s') = (\sigma_+,ss') \\ (\psi,s)\times(\sigma_-,s') = (\sigma_-,-ss') \\ (\sigma_+,s)\times(\sigma_+,s') = (I,ss')+(\psi,ss') \\ (\sigma_-,s)\times(\sigma_-,s') = (I,ss')+(\psi,-ss') \\ (\sigma_+,s)\times(\sigma_-,s') = Y \\ (\sigma_\pm,s)\times Y = (\sigma_\mp,+)+(\sigma_\mp,-) \end{gathered} \tag{499}$$

The fusion rules are identical to those of two copies of Ising categories: $\{I,\sigma_1,\psi_1\}\times\{I,\sigma_2,\psi_2\}$ once we make the following identification:

$$\begin{gathered} I\leftrightarrow(I,+), \psi_1\psi_2\leftrightarrow(I,-) \\ \psi_1\leftrightarrow(\psi,+), \psi_2\leftrightarrow(\psi,-) \\ \sigma_1\leftrightarrow(\sigma_+,+), \sigma_1\psi_2\leftrightarrow(\sigma_+,-) \\ \sigma_2\leftrightarrow(\sigma_-,+), \sigma_2\psi_1\leftrightarrow(\sigma_-,-) \\ \sigma_1\sigma_2\leftrightarrow Y \end{gathered} \tag{500}$$

The topological twists of $(\sigma_\pm,\pm)$ are $\pm\sqrt{\kappa}e^{\pm i\frac{\pi}{8}}$. Depending on whether $\kappa=1$ or $-1$, the gauged theory is identified with $\text{Ising}^{(1)}\times\overline{\text{Ising}}^{(1)}$ or $\text{Ising}^{(3)}\times\overline{\text{Ising}}^{(3)}$.

As aforementioned the electric-magnetic duality in $\mathbb{Z}_2$ toric codes can be realized as an on-site symmetry. We now briefly describe a concrete model. We start from a spin-$1/2$ fermionic superconductor with the pairing $(p+ip)^\nu_\uparrow\times(p-ip)^\nu_\downarrow$ where $\nu$ is an odd integer. This is a model of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ fermionic SPT phase discussed in Sec. X B. Now we gauge the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ fermion parity of the whole system, i.e. coupling all fermions to a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ gauge field, and we obtain a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ toric code, where $m$ is the $\pi$ flux in the original superconductor and $e$ is the bound state of the $\pi$ flux and a fermion. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry that protects the SPT phase, namely the fermion parity of the spin $\uparrow$ fermions, now becomes the $e\leftrightarrow m$ symmetry of the toric code. To see this, we first notice that before the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ total fermion parity is gauged, a $\pi$ flux localizes two Majorana zero modes $\gamma_\uparrow$ and $\gamma_\downarrow$ since it penetrates two $p\pm ip$ superconductors. Under the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry $\gamma_\uparrow\to-\gamma_\uparrow,\gamma_\downarrow\to\gamma_\downarrow$, so the local fermion parity $i\gamma_\uparrow\gamma_\downarrow$ on the $\pi$ flux changes sign under the on-site $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry, which interchanges $e$ and $m$ after the total fermion parity is fully gauged. This provides the desired on-site realization. We can turn this model of a fermionic superconductor coupled to a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ gauge field into a Kitaev-type spin model.

In this model, gauging the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry becomes particularly easy: we simply gauge the fermion parities of the spin $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ fermions separately, and the result is nothing but $\text{Ising}^{(\nu)}\times\overline{\text{Ising}}^{(\nu)}$. However, $\nu$ and $\nu+8$, as well as $\nu$ and $-\nu$, lead to exactly the same topological gauge theories, so we only obtain two distinct gauge theories corresponding to $\nu=1,3$, in agreement with our previous analysis.

### H. Double-Layer Systems $\mathcal{B}\times\mathcal{B}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry

Let us consider two identical, non-interacting layers of a topological phase described by the UMTC $\mathcal{B}$. The topological order of the double-layer system is described by $\mathcal{B}\times\mathcal{B}$. There is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry which exchanges the two layers. Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the subcategory of Abelian anyons in $\mathcal{B}$. We can generally prove that the symmetry fractionalization $H^2_\rho(\mathbb{Z}_2,\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{A})$ is trivial: as shown in previous examples, the 2-cocycle condition leads to $\mathfrak{w}(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{g})=(a,a)$ where $a\in\mathcal{A}$. However, this is again a coboundary, since $(a,a)=\ ^{\mathbf{g}}(a,0)\times(a,0)$. So $H^2_\rho(\mathbb{Z}_2,\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{A})=0$.

The number of defects is obviously equal to $|\mathcal{B}|$. There is a "bare" defect $X_0$ which has the following fusion rule:

$$X_0\times X_0=\sum_{a\in\mathcal{B}}(a,\overline{a}). \tag{501}$$

The quantum dimension $d_{X_0}=\sqrt{\sum_a d_a^2}=\mathcal{D}$. The other defects are $X_a$ where $a\in\mathcal{B}$:

$$X_0\times(a,0)=X_0\times(0,a)=X_a. \tag{502}$$

The fusion rules of $X_a$ can be easily deduced. For example,

$$\begin{gathered} X_a\times(b,c)=X_0\times(a,0)\times(b,0)\times(c,0)=\sum_e N^e_{abc}X_e \\ X_a\times X_b=\sum_c(c,\overline{c})\times(a,0)\times(b,0)=\sum_{c,e}N^e_{abc}(e,\overline{c}) \end{gathered} \tag{503}$$

Here we introduce $N^e_{abc}=\dim V^e_{abc}=\sum_f N^f_{ab}N^e_{fc}$.

Let us consider the gauged theory. For each $a\in\mathcal{B}$, $(a,a)$ is an orbit which splits into two topological charges. For each pair $a,b\in\mathcal{B},a\neq b$, $\{(a,b),(b,a)\}$ is an orbit which becomes a topological charge with dimensions $2d_ad_b$. Each defect splits into two topological charges. All together we have $\frac{|\mathcal{B}|(|\mathcal{B}|+7)}{2}$ topological charges.

Let us consider the ground state degeneracy on a genus $g$ surface. This consists of $2^{2g}$ different sectors, depending on whether there is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ twist along any of the $2g$ independent non-contractible cycles. As discussed in Section VII B, when $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ all twisted sectors can be mapped onto each other using Dehn twists, and therefore have the same number of ground states. It follows that the ground state degeneracy on a genus $g$ surface, $\mathcal{N}_g$, is given by

$$\mathcal{N}_g = \frac{\mathcal{N}_g^{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{N}_g^{\mathcal{B}}+1)}{2} + (2^{2g}-1)\frac{\mathcal{N}_{2g-1}^{\mathcal{B}} + \mathcal{I}_{2g-1}^{\mathcal{B}}}{2}, \quad (504)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_g^{\mathcal{B}}$ is the ground state degeneracy of $\mathcal{B}$ on a genus $g$ surface. The first term on the RHS is the number of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant states in the untwisted sector. The factor $\frac{\mathcal{N}_{2g-1}^{\mathcal{B}}+\mathcal{I}_{2g-1}^{\mathcal{B}}}{2}$ is the number of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant states in each twisted sector, and there are $2^{2g}-1$ twisted sectors total. Since all twisted sectors can be mapped to each other with Dehn twists, it is sufficient to consider the sector with a single $\mathbb{Z}_2$ twist along a single cycle. The system is then equivalent to a single copy of $\mathcal{B}$ on a genus $2g-1$ surface, with a non-trivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action. $\mathcal{I}_{2g-1}^{\mathcal{B}}$ is the number of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant states, which is given by the formula:

$$\mathcal{I}_{2g-1}^{\mathcal{B}} = \prod_{i=1}^{g-1} (N_{a_i\overline{a_i}}^{b_i})^2 N_{a_g\overline{a_g}}^{b_g} I_{b_1,b_2,\ldots,b_g}, \quad (505)$$

with

$$I_{b_1,b_2,\ldots,b_g} = \sum_{c_i\in\mathcal{C}} (N_{b_1b_2}^{c_1} N_{c_1b_3}^{c_2} \ldots N_{c_{g-3}b_{g-1}}^{c_{g-2}})^2 N_{c_{g-2}b_g}^{c_{g-2}} \quad (506)$$

To give an interesting example, let $\mathcal{B}$ be the Fibonnaci category. The quantum dimensions of the gauged theory agree exactly with the $\overline{\mathrm{SU}(2)_8}$ theory. One can also check that by condensing the highest spin boson in $\overline{\mathrm{SU}(2)_8}$ the resulting phase is indeed Fib$\times$ Fib [75].

As another example, consider the case where $\mathcal{B} = \mathrm{D}(G)$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is the quantum double of a discrete group $G$. Then, the gauged theory is $(\mathcal{B}\times\mathcal{B})/\mathbb{Z}_2 = \mathrm{D}((G\times G)\rtimes\mathbb{Z}_2)$. For example, when $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$, $\mathcal{B}$ is the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ toric code phase, and gauging the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry of two layers of toric code gives the quantum double of $(\mathbb{Z}_2\times\mathbb{Z}_2)\rtimes\mathbb{Z}_2$, which is the dihedral group of order 8, $\mathbb{D}_8$. This theory has, for example, 22 states on a torus.

### I. $S_3$-Gauge Theory D($S_3$) with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry

First we briefly review the anyon model of D($S_3$). The topological charges are labeled by a pair $([a],\pi_a)$ where $a\in S_3$, $[a]$ is the corresponding conjugacy class and $\pi_a$ is an irreducible representation of the centralizer of $a$ in $S_3$. There are three conjugacy classes in $S_3$: $C_1 = e, C_2 = (12),(23),(13), C_3 = (123),(132)$. For $C_1$, the centralizer of the identity element $e$ is just $S_3$ which has three irreducible representations, the trivial one, the sign one and the 2-dimensional one. The corresponding anyon labels are denoted by $I, B, C$, where $I$ is the vacuum. For $C_2$, we pick $a = (12)$ and the centralizer is $\mathbb{Z}_2$, so we have two anyon labels $D$ and $E$ where $D$ corresponds to the trivial representation of $\mathbb{Z}_2$. For $C_3$, we pick $(123)$ whose centralizer is $\mathbb{Z}_3$, so we get three anyon labels $F, G, H$ where $F$ corresponds to the trivial representation of $\mathbb{Z}_3$. Altogether we have 8 topological charges. For a complete list of the fusion rules, $F, R$ symbols and the modular data we refer the readers to Ref. [162].

There is an interesting $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry in this theory, namely we can exchange $C$ and $F$, a kind of "electromagnetic duality", since we exchange a charge (representation) and a flux (a nontrivial conjugacy class).

We start from the fusion rules of the twist defects. Naïvely, one might write down the following fusion rules

$$\sigma\times\overline{\sigma} = I + G + H. \quad (507)$$

This is however incorrect. To see the inconsistency let us consider the fusion $C\times C\times\sigma\times\overline{\sigma}$. Consistency between associativity and $G$-crossed action requires that

$$C\times C\times\sigma\times\overline{\sigma} = C\times F\times\sigma\times\overline{\sigma}. \quad (508)$$

Since $C\times\sigma = \sigma\times^{\mathbf{g}} C = \sigma\times F$. The left-hand side gives

$$(I+B+C)\times(I+G+H) = I+B+C+2F+3G+3H, \quad (509)$$

while the right-hand side

$$(G+H)\times(I+G+H) = 2(I+B+C+F+G+H). \quad (510)$$

This proves that Eq. (507) does not yield a consistent fusion theory.

In fact, we can check that $\sigma\times\overline{\sigma} = I+G$ or $\sigma\times\overline{\sigma} = I+H$ both satisfy Eq. (508). We therefore postulate that both fusion rules are realized in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$. In fact, the resulting gauged theory is $\mathrm{SU}(2)_4\times\overline{\mathrm{SU}(2)}_4$. Condensing the self-dual boson (the bound state of the highest spin particle in $\mathrm{SU}(2)_4$ and the corresponding one in the conjugate) indeed gives back D($S_3$) [78].

To further verify this, and to give an example of some nontrivial features of the ground state degeneracy calculations, let us consider the ground state degeneracy of the gauged theory on a torus, $\mathcal{N}_1$. D($S_3$) has 8 states on a torus, but only 7 of them are invariant under the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ transformation. Furthermore, the three twisted sectors each contain the same degeneracy, because they can be mapped into each other under Dehn twists. In the presence of a single twist along one cycle, there are 6 states, because there are 6 $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant anyons in D($S_3$). Summing all these states we obtain

$$\mathcal{N}_1 = 7 + 3\times 6 = 25, \quad (511)$$

which agrees with the degeneracy of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_4\times\overline{\mathrm{SU}(2)}_4$ on a torus, as expected.

Now let us consider the genus 2 degeneracy, $\mathcal{N}_2$. This can be written as

$$\mathcal{N}_2 = \mathcal{I}_2^0 + 15\mathcal{I}_2^{\mathrm{tw}}. \quad (512)$$

$\mathcal{I}_2^0$ is the number of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant states in the untwisted sector, which is the number of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant states of the D($S_3$) theory

on a genus 2 surface. $\mathcal{I}_2^{\rm tw}$ is the number of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant states in the presence of a single $\mathbb{Z}_2$ twist along one cycle of the genus 2 surface; the factor 15 is the total number of twisted sectors.

Let us begin by computing $\mathcal{I}_2^0$. To do so, we first pick a basis for the states in the ungauged theory, which we denote $|a_1, a_2, b\rangle$, and a diagrammatic representation is given by

$|a_1, a_2, b\rangle \equiv$ 


And the number of such states is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_2^0$. Let us consider the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ on these states. If any of the three labels is changed under $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$, the state is clearly non-invariant. All such states can be grouped into pairs which are permuted into each other under the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action.

The rest of the states all have $\mathbb{Z}_2$-invariant anyon labels, but this alone does not mean that they are $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant. Let us denote the number of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-odd states (but with invariant anyon labels) by $\mathcal{A}_2^0$. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action on the fusion states is given by

$$e^{i\theta(a_1,a_2,b)} = \frac{U_{\mathbf{g}}(a_1,\bar{a}_1;b)U_{\mathbf{g}}(a_2,\bar{a}_2;0)}{U_{\mathbf{g}}(a_2,\bar{a}_2;b)U_{\mathbf{g}}(a_1,\bar{a}_1;0)}. \tag{513}$$

For simplicity we assume here that all fusion vertices have no multiplicities.

We consider $a_1 = G, a_2 = H, b = 0$ or $B$. The relevant fusion rules are

$$\begin{aligned} G\times G &= I + B + G \\ G\times H &= I + B + H \\ G\times H &= C + F \end{aligned} \tag{514}$$

In order to determine the $U$ symbols, we need the following $F$-symbols [162]

$$F_H^{GGH} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{515}$$

Here the rows of the matrix are indexed by $I, B$ and the columns are indexed by $C, F$. The invariance of the $F$-symbol under the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action gives

$$\begin{aligned} U(G,G;I) &= U(G,H;C)U(G,C;H) \\ U(G,G;I) &= U(G,H;F)U(G,F;H) \\ U(G,G;B)U(B,H;H) &= -U(G,H;C)U(G,C;H) \\ U(G,G;B)U(B,H;H) &= -U(G,H;F)U(G,F;H), \end{aligned} \tag{516}$$

from which we conclude that

$$U(G,G;I) = -U(G,G;B)U(B,H;H). \tag{517}$$

Using bending moves one can derive that $U(B,H;H) = U(H,H;I)U^{-1}(H,H;B)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} e^{i\theta(G,H,B)} &= \frac{U(G,G;B)U(H,H;I)}{U(H,H;B)U(G,G;I)} \\ &= \frac{U(G,G;B)U(B,H;H)}{U(G,G;I)} = -1 \end{aligned} \tag{518}$$

Similarly, we have $e^{i\theta(H,G,B)} = -1$. One can show that all the other states are $\mathbb{Z}_2$-invariant. Therefore we conclude that $\mathcal{A}_2^0 = 2$.

Now we can count the number of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-invariant states, denoted by $\mathcal{D}_2^0$. It is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{D}_2^0 = \sum_{a_1,a_2,b\neq C,F}{}' N_{a_1\bar{a}_1}^b N_{ba_2}^{a_2} \tag{519}$$

where the prime on the sum indicates that the terms where $(a_1,a_2,b) = (G,H,B)$ or $(H,G,B)$ should be left out. Performing the sum, we find

$$\mathcal{D}_2^0 = 56. \tag{520}$$

The remaining states in the ungauged theory are permuted into each other under the $Z_2$ action. It follows that

$$\mathcal{I}_2^0 = \frac{\mathcal{N}_2^0 - \mathcal{A}_2^0 + \mathcal{D}_2^0}{2} \tag{521}$$

Thus we find $\mathcal{I}_2^0 = 85$.

Now let us compute $\mathcal{I}_2^{\rm tw}$. Here, we follow the same strategy as before. In the ungauged theory, there are $\mathcal{N}_2^{0;\rm tw} = \sum_{a_1,a_2,b} N_{a_1,\overline{a_1}}^b N_{b,a_2}^{\rho(a_2)} = 98$ states with a single $\mathbb{Z}_2$ twist along one cycle. Of these, 2 of them acquire a minus sign under the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action, $\mathcal{D}_2^{0;\rm tw} = \mathcal{D}_2^0 = 56$ are already invariant under the $Z_2$ action, and the rest are permuted into each other under the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action. The number of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant states in the twisted sector is therefore $\mathcal{I}_2^{0;\rm tw} = (98-2+56)/2 = 76$. Therefore we find a total of

$$\mathcal{N}_2 = 85 + 15\times 76 = 1225, \tag{522}$$

which agrees exactly with the genus 2 degeneracy of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_4\times\overline{\mathrm{SU}(2)_4}$, as expected.

### J. 3-Fermion Model $\mathbf{SO}(8)_1$, a.k.a. $\mathbf{D}'(\mathbb{Z}_2)$, with $S_3$ symmetry

In this section, we consider a theory with a non-Abelian symmetry: the $\mathrm{SO}(8)_1$ theory, which has three mutually semionic fermionic anyons. We denote the three fermions by $\psi_i, i = 1,2,3$. They form a $\mathbb{Z}_2\times\mathbb{Z}_2$ fusion algebra, similar to that of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ toric code. The $F$-symbols are all trivial and the $R$-symbols are

$$\begin{aligned} R_1^{\psi_i\psi_i} = -1, R^{\psi_i\psi_j} = -R^{\psi_j\psi_i} \text{ for } i\neq j \\ R_{\psi_3}^{\psi_1\psi_2} = R_{\psi_1}^{\psi_2\psi_3} = R_{\psi_2}^{\psi_3\psi_1} = -1. \end{aligned} \tag{523}$$

The three fermions can be arbitrarily permuted and the modular data are completely invariant, so the theory has a $S_3$ symmetry. Recently, this topological phase has been proposed to exist at the surface of a bosonic 3D time-reversal-invariant topological superconductor [86, 163]. We also notice that this theory can arise in the following physical way: consider three identical layers of semions $\{I, s_1\} \times \{I, s_2\} \times \{I, s_3\}$, e.g. three layers of $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$ bosonic Laughlin states. We identify a subtheory $\{I, s_1s_2, s_2s_3, s_1s_3\}$ as the $\mathrm{SO}(8)_1$ theory with $c_- = 4$ and the rest is the conjugate of semions $\{I, s_1s_2s_3\}$ with $c_- = -1$. So the $S_3$ symmetry is just the permutation symmetry of the three layers, which only acts on the three-fermion sector. In fact, this type of layer permutation symmetry and the associated defects have been considered in Ref. [12].

As before, first one can calculate the symmetry fractionalization class $H^2_\rho(S_3, \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$ [164]. So there are no nontrivial symmetry fractionalizations.

Let us set up some notations for the $S_3$ group. We represent $S_3$ as the permutation group of three objects and the five non-identity elements are denoted by $(12), (23), (13), (123), (132)$. Since $S_3 = \mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$, we start our preparatory analysis from the two subgroups.

#### 1. $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry

Without loss of generality, we consider the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry exchanges $\psi_1$ and $\psi_2$, i.e. the sector $\mathcal{C}_{(12)}$. The analysis is almost the same as what we have done for the toric code, and one can easily see that the two defects should have topological twists $\pm e^{\frac{i\pi n}{8}}$ and $\pm e^{\frac{i\pi(8-n)}{8}}$. The distinct choices are $n = 1, 3$, due to $H^3(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathrm{U}(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$. For completeness we list the fusion rules:

$$\begin{gathered} z_\pm \times z_\pm = I + \psi_3 \\ z_+ \times z_- = \psi_1 + \psi_2 \\ z_\pm \times \psi_1 = z_\mp, z_\pm \times \psi_2 = z_\mp \\ z_\pm \times \psi_3 = z_\pm \end{gathered} \tag{524}$$

Here $z_\pm$ denotes the two $\mathbb{Z}_2$ defects. If the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry is gauged, we end up with $\mathrm{Ising}^{(1)} \times \mathrm{Ising}^{(7)}$ or $\mathrm{Ising}^{(3)} \times \mathrm{Ising}^{(5)}$.

The other two sectors $\mathcal{C}_{(23)}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{(13)}$ are similar.

#### 2. $\mathbb{Z}_3$ symmetry

Under $G = \mathbb{Z}_3$ action the three fermions are cyclically permuted: $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(\psi_i) = {}^{\mathbf{g}}\psi_i = \psi_{[i+1]_3}$. A simple calculation shows $H^2_\rho(\mathbb{Z}_3, \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0$. There are two defect sectors, corresponding to the two nonzero group elements in $G$, dual to each other. Since there is no fixed point, each defect sector has only one type of defect, which we denote by $w$ and $\overline{w}$ respectively. Their fusion rules are easily obtained:

$$\begin{gathered} w \times \psi_i = w, \overline{w} \times \psi_i = \overline{w} \\ w \times \overline{w} = I + \psi_1 + \psi_2 + \psi_3, \end{gathered} \tag{525}$$

which implies $d_w = d_{\overline{w}} = 2$.

Since $w$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_3$ defect, fusing $w$ with itself should give $\overline{w}$. In order to match the quantum dimensions, we have to allow multiplicity here:

$$w \times w = 2\overline{w}, \overline{w} \times \overline{w} = 2w. \tag{526}$$

Physically, the multiplicity can be understood from the two anti-commuting Wilson loop operators around two $w$ defects.

To obtain the $F$ symbols we solve the pentagon equations [16, 158]. First we give $F$-symbols where no fusion multiplicities are involved:

$$\begin{gathered} F_w^{abw} = \chi(b, {}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}a) \\ F_w^{wab} = \chi(a, {}^{\mathbf{g}}b) \\ F_w^{awb} = \chi(b, {}^{\mathbf{g}}a)\chi(a, {}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}b) \\ F_b^{w\bar{w}a} = \chi(a, {}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}b) \\ F_b^{aw\bar{w}} = \chi(a - b, {}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}a) \\ F_b^{wa\bar{w}} = \chi(b, {}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}a)\chi(a, {}^{\mathbf{g}}(a + b)) \\ [F_w^{w\bar{w}w}]_{ab} = \frac{1}{2}\chi(b, {}^{\mathbf{g}}(a + b))\chi(a, {}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}}b) \end{gathered} \tag{527}$$

Here $\chi$ is a symmetric bi-character on the fusion algebra. In the above equations, we can exchange $w$ and $\bar{w}$, and at the same time replace $\mathbf{g}$ with $\bar{\mathbf{g}} = \mathbf{g}^{-1}$ on the right sides. The bi-character $\chi$ is fixed by the $G$-crossed heptagon equations:

$$\chi(a, b) = R^{ba}. \tag{528}$$

We list the rest of the nontrivial $F$-symbols, which involve fusion multiplicities, in Table I. The $\mathbb{Z}_3$ phase $\alpha$, being a 3rd root of unity, is closely related to the 3rd Frobenius-Schur indicator related to the trivalent vertex $w \times w \to \overline{w}$, which is determined by the choice in $H^3(\mathbb{Z}_3, \mathrm{U}(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_3$.

Solving $G$-crossed hexagon equations with a gauge fixing $\eta \equiv 1$ yields the $R$-symbols

$$\begin{gathered} R^{wa} = R^{\overline{w}a} = -1 \\ R^{ww}_{\overline{w}} = \theta_w e^{-\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, R^{\overline{w}\overline{w}}_{w} = \theta_{\overline{w}} e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \\ R_I^{w\overline{w}} = R_a^{w\overline{w}} = \theta_w^{-1} \\ R_I^{\overline{w}w} = \theta_{\overline{w}}^{-1}, R_a^{\overline{w}w} = -\theta_{\overline{w}}^{-1} \end{gathered} \tag{529}$$

Here $a = \psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_3$ and $\theta_w^3 = \theta_{\overline{w}}^3 = \alpha^{-1}$. Obviously, $\theta_w$ and $\theta_{\overline{w}}$ are the topological twist factors of the $w$ and $\overline{w}$ defects, respectively. As expected, they are determined up to 3rd roots of unity. Physically this uncertainty can be attributed to possible $\mathbb{Z}_3$ charges attached to the defects.

Notice that the $G$-crossed hexagon equations can not completely fix $R_w^{aw}$ and $R_{\overline{w}}^{a\overline{w}}$, but subject to the following conditions:

$$\prod_a R_w^{aw} = 1, R_w^{aw} R_{\overline{w}}^{\bar{\mathbf{g}}a, \overline{w}} = 1. \tag{530}$$

We also extract the relevant $U$ symbols:

$$\begin{gathered} U_{\mathbf{g}}(w, w; \overline{w}) = -\frac{\theta_{\overline{w}}}{\alpha\theta_w} e^{-\frac{i\pi}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \\ U_{\mathbf{g}}(w, \overline{w}; I) = \frac{\theta_w}{\theta_{\overline{w}}}. \end{gathered} \tag{531}$$

| $a$ | $I$ | $\psi_1$ | $\psi_2$ | $\psi_3$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $[F_{\overline{w}}^{aww}]_{(w,0,\mu),(\overline{w},\nu,0)}$ | $\sigma_0$ | $-i\sigma_1$ | $-i\sigma_3$ | $-i\sigma_2$ |
| $[F_{\overline{w}}^{waw}]_{(w,0,\mu),(\overline{w},0,\nu)}$ | $\sigma_0$ | $i\sigma_2$ | $i\sigma_1$ | $i\sigma_3$ |
| $[F_{\overline{w}}^{wwa}]_{(\overline{w},\mu,0),(w,0,\nu)}$ | $\sigma_0$ | $i\sigma_3$ | $i\sigma_2$ | $i\sigma_1$ |
| $[F_{w}^{a\overline{w}w}]_{(\overline{w},0,\mu),(w,\nu,0)}$ | $\sigma_0$ | $-i\sigma_2$ | $-i\sigma_1$ | $-i\sigma_3$ |
| $[F_{w}^{\overline{w}a\overline{w}}]_{(\overline{w},0,\mu),(w,0,\nu)}$ | $\sigma_0$ | $-i\sigma_1$ | $-i\sigma_3$ | $-i\sigma_2$ |
| $[F_{w}^{\overline{w}\overline{w}a}]_{(w,\mu,0),(\overline{w},0,\nu)}$ | $\sigma_0$ | $i\sigma_3$ | $i\sigma_2$ | $i\sigma_1$ |
| $[F_{a}^{www}]_{(\overline{w},\mu,0),(\overline{w},\nu,0)}$ | $-\alpha e^{-\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $\alpha e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,-1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $\alpha e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(-1,1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $\alpha e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,1,-1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ |
| $[F_{a}^{\overline{www}}]_{(w,\mu,0),(\overline{w},\nu,0)}$ | $-\alpha e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $-\alpha e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,-1,-1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $-\alpha e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(-1,-1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $-\alpha e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(-1,1,-1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ |
| $[F_{w}^{ww\overline{w}}]_{(\overline{w},\mu,\nu),(a,0,0)}$ | $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(-1,-1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(-1,1,-1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,-1,-1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ |
| $[F_{\overline{w}}^{\overline{ww}w}]_{(w,\mu,\nu),(a,0,0)}$ | $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(-1,1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,1,-1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ | $-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{\pi i}{3\sqrt{3}}(1,-1,1)\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ |
| $[F_{w}^{\overline{w}ww}]_{(a,0,0),(\overline{w},\nu,\mu)}$ | $-\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}\alpha}\sigma_2$ | $-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\alpha}\sigma_0$ | $\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}\alpha}\sigma_3$ | $-\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}\alpha}\sigma_1$ |
| $[F_{\overline{w}}^{w\overline{ww}}]_{(a,0,0),(\overline{w},\nu,\mu)}$ | $\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}\alpha}\sigma_2$ | $-\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}\alpha}\sigma_3$ | $\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}\alpha}\sigma_1$ | $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\alpha}\sigma_0$ |

TABLE I: $F$-symbols that involve fusion multiplicities. $\mu,\nu$ index the fusion states. The $\mu\nu$ matrix element of each entry gives the value of the corresponding $F$-symbol.

In other words, the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ symmetry action on the $V_{\overline{w}}^{ww}$ space is nontrivial.

We now consider the gauged theory. The $G$ orbits of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ are $I,\{\psi_1,\psi_2,\psi_3\},w,\overline{w}$. $I,w,\overline{w}$ each splits into 3, labeled as e.g. $(I,n)$ where $n=0,1,2$ labels irreducible representations of $\mathbb{Z}_3$. $\{\psi_1,\psi_2,\psi_3\}$ becomes a $d=3$ anyon, which will be denoted by $Y$. Altogether we have $3+6+1=10$ anyons. Assuming $\alpha=e^{\frac{2\pi ik}{3}},\theta_w=\theta_{\overline{w}}$, the fusion rules between non-Abelian topological charges can be computed using Eq. (407):

$$\begin{aligned}(w,n)\times(w,m)&=(\overline{w},[n+m-k+1]_3)+(\overline{w},[n+m-k-1]_3)\\(w,n)\times(\overline{w},m)&=(I,[n+m]_3)+Y\\(w,n)\times Y&=\sum_m(w,m)\\(\overline{w},n)\times Y&=\sum_m(\overline{w},m)\\Y\times Y&=\sum_n(I,n)+2Y.\end{aligned}\tag{532}$$

Notice that in computing the fusion of $(w,n)$ and $(w,m)$, there are two terms on the right hand side because $V_{ww}^{\overline{w}}$ carries a nontrivial reducible 2-dimensional representation of $\mathbb{Z}_3$, see Eq. (531).

This fusion category as given in Eq. (532) is identified with that of $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$ for $k=\pm1$. For later convenience, we label the three gauge charges by $(I,0)\equiv1,(I,1)\equiv a,(I,2)\equiv\overline{a}$. The six fluxes are labeled by $w_i\equiv(w,i),\overline{w}_i=(\overline{w},i),i=0,1,2$.

### 3. $S_3$ Symmetry

Now we consider the $S_3$ extension. Since $H^4(S_3,\mathrm{U}(1))=0$, there is no obstruction to extension. There are six sectors $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ where $\mathbf{g}\in S_3$. From our previous discussions we can write down all fusion rules within each sector. The fusion rules between the $(12),(23),(13)$ sectors can also be written down rather straightforwardly:

$$\begin{aligned}x_\alpha\times z_\beta&=\overline{w},z_\beta\times x_\alpha=w\\x_\alpha\times y_\beta&=w,y_\beta\times x_\alpha=\overline{w}\\y_\alpha\times z_\beta&=w,z_\beta\times y_\alpha=\overline{w}.\end{aligned}\tag{533}$$

Let us consider the fusion rules between $x,y,z$ and $w,\overline{w}$:

$$\begin{aligned}x_+\times w&=x_-\times w=y_++y_-\\w\times x_+&=w\times x_-=z_++z_-\end{aligned}\tag{534}$$

The other fusion rules can be obtained by cyclically permuting $x,y,z$. One may wonder whey we exclude the other possibility $x_+\times w=2y_+$(or $y_-$). If this is the case, we can fuse both sides with $\psi_2$ and we get $x_-\times w=2y_-$. On the other hand, we can consider fusing $\psi_3\times x_+\times w$. We first fuse $\psi_3$ with $x_+$ and we get back $x_+\times w$. We can also take $\psi_3$ around $w$ first and it becomes $\psi_1$, then fuse it with $x_+$, which leaves us with $x_-\times w$. So we conclude that $x_+\times w=x_-\times w$, which excludes the $x_\pm\times w=2y_\pm$ fusion rule.

In addition, we need to understand the symmetry actions on the defect sectors. In general, $\mathbf{g}$-action takes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{h}}$ to $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{ghg}^{-1}}$. Since $\mathcal{C}_{(123)}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{(132)}$ each contain one defect, the nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action is obviously given by:

$$(12),(23),(13):w\leftrightarrow\overline{w}.\tag{535}$$

The $\mathbb{Z}_3$ symmetry has nontrivial actions on $\mathcal{C}_{(12),(23),(13)}$. Since each of these sectors contains two defects, we need to determine the specific actions of $(123)$. Let us consider the action on $\mathcal{C}_{(12)}$. The two defects $z_\pm$ are distinguished by the eigenvalue of the local $\psi_3$ Wilson loop around the defect. Under $(123)$, $\mathcal{C}_{(12)}$ is mapped to $\mathcal{C}_{(23)}$ and $\psi_3$ is mapped to $\psi_1$. So it is natural to associate defects with the same eigenvalues of the invariant Wilson loops:

$$(123):z_\pm\to x_\pm.\tag{536}$$

The actions on the other two sectors can be obtained similarly.

### 4. Sequentially gauging the $S_3$ symmetry

We are now ready to gauge the whole $S_3$ symmetry. Our strategy is to break the $S_3$ symmetry into the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ which is a normal subgroup and the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup and gauge them sequentially [165]. We have learnt that gauging the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ symmetry gives a $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$-type theory. So we just need to gauge the remaining $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry, which has a nontrivial action on $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$:

$$^{\mathbf{g}}a = \overline{a}, ^{\mathbf{g}}w_i = \overline{w}_i, ^{\mathbf{g}}Y = Y. \tag{537}$$

Although not necessary in our following discussion, we would like to remark that the symmetry action on the two-dimensional $Y \times Y \to Y$ fusion space is nontrivial. This can be seen by imposing the invariance of $F$-symbols under symmetry action. In this case, the relevant $F$-symbols are

$$F_a^{YYY} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}, F_{\overline{a}}^{YYY} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{538}$$

Assume that the symmetry action

$$\widetilde{|Y,Y;Y,\mu\rangle} = \sum_\nu u_{\mu\nu} |Y,Y;Y,\nu\rangle, \tag{539}$$

where $u$ is a unitary matrix and the condition $F_{\overline{a}}^{YYY} = uF_a^{YYY}u^{-1}$ gives $-\sigma_y = u\sigma_y u^{-1}$. In other words, the symmetry action on the $|Y,Y,Y\rangle$ space is nontrivial.

Let us consider the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ defects. There are two of them due to the existence of a fixed-point anyon $Y$ and we denote them by $\sigma_\pm$. We first state the conjectured fusion rules:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_\pm \times \sigma_\pm &= I + a + \overline{a} + Y + \sum_i (w_i + \overline{w}_i) \\ \sigma_\pm \times \sigma_\mp &= 2Y + \sum_i (w_i + \overline{w}_i) \\ w \times \sigma_\pm &= \sigma_+ + \sigma_- \\ Y \times \sigma_+ &= 2\sigma_- + \sigma_+ \\ Y \times \sigma_- &= 2\sigma_+ + \sigma_- \\ a \times \sigma_\pm &= \sigma_\pm \end{aligned} \tag{540}$$

To justify these fusion rules, it is useful to revert to the $S_3$ extended category. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$-extended $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$ category should be equivalent to the $S_3$-extended category, but "gauging" the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ subgroup. Armed with this perspective, we immediately see that the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ defects in $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$ are the "equivariantized" orbit of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ defects in $\mathcal{C}_{(12),(23),(13)}$. Schematically, we can write

$$\sigma_\pm \simeq x_\pm + y_\pm + z_\pm. \tag{541}$$

To actually use the general formula Eq. (407), we will have to solve the entire extended category to obtain the $U$ symbols. However we will just use this expression to make heuristic derivation of the fusion rules. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_+ \times \sigma_+ &= (x_+ + y_+ + z_+) \times (x_+ + y_+ + z_+) \\ &= (I + \psi_1) + (I + \psi_2) + (I + \psi_3) + \\ &\quad (w + \overline{w}) + (w + \overline{w}) + (w + \overline{w}) \end{aligned} \tag{542}$$

The multiple occurrence of the vacuum $I$ should be interpreted as $I + a + \overline{a}$ ($a$ is the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ charge) and similar for $w + \overline{w}$. $\psi_1 + \psi_2 + \psi_3$ is identified with $Y$. We therefore have

$$\sigma_+ \times \sigma_+ = I + a + \overline{a} + Y + \sum_i (w_i + \overline{w}_i), \tag{543}$$

which gives $d_{\sigma_\pm} = 3\sqrt{2}$. The other fusion rules can be "derived" in a similar fashion. We have checked that the fusion rules are associative and satisfy all the symmetry properties.

In addition, without solving the crossed hexagon equations for the complicated $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$ theory, we can directly read off the topological twists of the $\sigma_\pm$ defects, since their twists are the same as the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ defects in the $\mathrm{SO}(8)_1$ theory, as suggested by Eq. (412).

We are now ready to attack our final goal, the gauged theory. First we count the number of topological charges. The vacuum 1 and the $G$-invariant topological charge $Y$ each split into two. The two $\mathbb{Z}_2$ defects $\sigma_\pm$ split into four $\mathbb{Z}_2$ fluxes. $a$ and $\overline{a}$ are symmetrized into a $d = 2$ boson. $w_i$ and $\overline{w}_i$ are symmetrized into three $d = 4$ topological charges, and the twist factors are unchanged. So altogether, we have $4+1+3+2+2 = 12$ topological charges. Their quantum dimensions are $1, 1, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 4, 3\sqrt{2}, 3\sqrt{2}, 3\sqrt{2}, 3\sqrt{2}$. Their topological twists factors are also known and are listed in Table II. To get the fusion rule of the gauged theory in principle one needs the full data of the $G$-crossed braiding, especially the $U_{\mathbf{g}}$ symbols. Fortunately, in this case we find that merely requiring associativity is enough to constrain the fusion rules obtained by equivariantization. With the fusion rules and the topological twist factors, we can compute the $S$-matrix. There are 6 possibilities for the topological twists in accordance with $H^3(S_3, \mathrm{U}(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_6$. Choosing $\alpha = e^{\frac{4\pi i}{3}}, \nu = 1$, the resulting $S$-matrix is [165]

$$\mathcal{D}S = \tag{544}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 3\sqrt{2} & 3\sqrt{2} & 3\sqrt{2} & 3\sqrt{2} \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 4 & -3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} \\ 2 & 2 & 4 & 6 & 6 & -4 & -4 & -4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 3 & 6 & -3 & -3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} & 3\sqrt{2} & 3\sqrt{2} \\ 3 & 3 & 6 & -3 & -3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3\sqrt{2} & 3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} \\ 4 & 4 & -4 & 0 & 0 & b & c & a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 4 & -4 & 0 & 0 & c & a & b & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 4 & -4 & 0 & 0 & a & b & c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} & 0 & -3\sqrt{2} & 3\sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 6 & -6 \\ 3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} & 0 & -3\sqrt{2} & 3\sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -6 & 6 \\ 3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} & 0 & 3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 6 & -6 & 0 & 0 \\ 3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} & 0 & 3\sqrt{2} & -3\sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -6 & 6 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Here $a = -8\cos\frac{2\pi}{9}, b = -8\sin\frac{\pi}{9}, c = 8\cos\frac{\pi}{9}$. The columns(rows) are ordered as in Table II. We will not write the fusion rules explicitly, since they can be obtained easily from the $S$-matrix using the Verlinde formula. To the best of our knowledge, this 12-particle MTC was not previously known.

### 5. Ground state degeneracy of the gauged theory

Let us also illustrate the ground state degeneracy computations for genus 1 and 2, by using information obtained only

| Label | $d$ | $\theta$ |
|---|---|---|
| $(I,+)$ | 1 | 1 |
| $(I,-)$ | 1 | 1 |
| $\{a,\overline{a}\}$ | 2 | 1 |
| $(Y,+)$ | 3 | $-1$ |
| $(Y,-)$ | 3 | $-1$ |
| $\{w,\overline{w}\}$ | 4 | $\alpha^{-1/3}$ |
| $\{wa,\overline{wa}\}$ | 4 | $\omega\alpha^{-1/3}$ |
| $\{w\overline{a},\overline{w}a\}$ | 4 | $\omega^2\alpha^{-1/3}$ |
| $(\sigma_+,+)$ | $3\sqrt{2}$ | $e^{\frac{i\pi\nu}{8}}$ |
| $(\sigma_-,+)$ | $3\sqrt{2}$ | $-e^{-\frac{i\pi\nu}{8}}$ |
| $(\sigma_+,-)$ | $3\sqrt{2}$ | $-e^{\frac{i\pi\nu}{8}}$ |
| $(\sigma_-,-)$ | $3\sqrt{2}$ | $e^{-\frac{i\pi\nu}{8}}$ |

TABLE II: Topological charges in the gauged theory $\mathcal{C}/S_3$

from the $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$ theory, before the final $\mathbb{Z}_2$ gauging. To begin, the ground state degeneracy on a genus one surface is

$$\mathcal{N}_1 = \mathcal{I}_1 + 3\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathrm{tw}}, \tag{545}$$

where $\mathcal{I}_1$ consists of those states of the $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$ theory on a torus that are $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant, while $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathrm{tw}}$ is the number of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant states in the sector where there is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ twist along one cycle of the torus. The $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$ theory has 10 states on a torus; of these, 6 of them are $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant, so $\mathcal{I}_1 = 6$. The number of states in the presence of a single $\mathbb{Z}_2$ twist along one cycle of the torus is 2, and both are $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant, so $\mathcal{I}_1^{tw} = 2$. Therefore, we find

$$\mathcal{N}_1 = 12, \tag{546}$$

in agreement with the results found through other methods.

Now let us compute the genus 2 degeneracy, $\mathcal{N}_2$, which takes the form:

$$\mathcal{N}_2 = \mathcal{I}_2 + 15\mathcal{I}_2^{\mathrm{tw}}, \tag{547}$$

where now $\mathcal{I}_2$ is the number of states in the $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$ theory on a genus 2 surface after projecting to the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant subspace. $\mathcal{I}_2^{\mathrm{tw}}$ is the number of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant states in the $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$ theory on a genus 2 surface with a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ twist along one cycle. To compute $\mathcal{I}_2$, we pick a basis $|a_1, a_2, b\rangle_\mu$ for the states in the $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$ theory on a torus. Here the index $\mu$ labels states in the fusion space. $\mathcal{I}_2$ can be obtained by computing the total number of states $\mathcal{N}_2^{\mathbf{0}} = \sum_{a_1,a_2,b} N_{a_1,\overline{a_1}}^b N_{ba_2}^{a_2} = 166$ and the number of diagonal states $\mathcal{D}_2^{\mathbf{0}}$ which satisfy

$$\rho(|a_1, a_2, b\rangle_\mu) = |a_1, a_2, b\rangle_\mu. \tag{548}$$

In order to determine the number of such states, it is important to recall that the two-dimensional fusion/splitting space $|Y, Y; Y\rangle$ transforms non-trivially under the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{D}_2^{\mathbf{0}} = {\sum_{a_1,a_2,b\in\{1,Y\}}}' N_{a_1,\overline{a_1}}^b N_{ba_2}^{a_2} = 4. \tag{549}$$

The prime on the sum indicates that vertices where $a_1 = b = Y$, or $a_2 = b = Y$, must be omitted as these transform non-trivially under the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{I}_2 = \frac{166 + 4}{2} = 85. \tag{550}$$

Now let us compute $\mathcal{I}_2^{\mathrm{tw}}$. First, we compute the total number of states in the presence of a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ twist along a single cycle in $\mathrm{SU}(3)_3$, which is given by $\mathcal{N}_2^{\mathbf{0};\mathrm{tw}} = \sum_{a_1,a_2,b} N_{a_1,\overline{a}_1}^b N_{ba_2}^{\rho(a_2)} = 40$. The number of diagonal states are

$$\mathcal{D}_2^{\mathbf{0};\mathrm{tw}} = {\sum_{a_1,a_2,b\in\{1,Y\}}}' N_{a_1,\overline{a_1}}^b N_{ba_2}^{\rho(a_2)} = 4, \tag{551}$$

where again the prime on the sum indicates that vertices where $a_1 = b = Y$, or $a_2 = b = Y$, must be omitted as these transform non-trivially under the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action. Therefore, $\mathcal{I}_2^{\mathrm{tw}} = (40 + 4)/2 = 22$. Thus we find

$$\mathcal{N}_2 = 85 + 15 \times 22 = 415. \tag{552}$$

The above calculation agrees exactly with the formula $\mathcal{N}_2 = \mathcal{D}^{2(g-1)} \sum_i d_i^{-2(g-1)}$, for the quantum dimensions listed above.

### K. Rep($\mathbb{D}_{10}$) with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry: An $H^3_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ Obstruction

We provide an example of the $H^3_{[\rho]}(G,\mathcal{A})$ obstruction (i.e. obstruction to symmetry fractionalization) in a pre-modular category [166]. Consider the dihedral group $\mathbb{D}_{10} = \mathbb{Z}_{10} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ generated from two elements $r, s$ with $r^{10} = s^2 = 1, srs = r^{-1}$. It has 8 irreducible representations, four of which are 1-dimensional and the others 2-dimensional. We will consider the BTC $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Rep}(\mathbb{D}_{10})$. The fusion rules of $\mathcal{C}$ can be easily deduced from the character table of $\mathbb{D}_{10}$, which we spell out explicitly here: There are four Abelian topological charges, $I, A, B, C = AB$ which form a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ fusion subalgebra and 4 non-Abelian ones $X_{1,2,3,4}$ of dimension 2, such that

$$\begin{aligned} A \times X_i &= X_i \\ B \times X_i &= C \times X_i = X_{5-i} \\ X_i \times X_j &= \begin{cases} X_{i+j} + X_{|i-j|} & i+j \le 5 \\ X_{10-i-j} + X_{|i-j|} & i+j > 5 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{553}$$

where we define $X_0 = I + A, X_5 = B + C$. The $F$-symbols (or Wigner $6j$-symbols) of this category can be computed from the Clebsch-Gordon coefficients.

In addition, this category also admits braiding. In fact, the representation category of any finite group can be endowed with symmetric braiding, i.e. all topological charges have twist factors 1 and $S_{ab} = \frac{d_a d_b}{\mathcal{D}}$ for all topological charges $a, b$, which is apparently non-modular. Therefore a representation category $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$ for any finite group $G$ can not exist alone physically, but one can always embed it into the quantum double $\mathrm{D}(G)$ as the charge sector. It is further known that

the quantum double $\mathrm{D}(G)$ is the minimal modular extension of $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$ [167].

We now define an obstructed $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry on $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathbb{D}_{10})$. We first define an automorphism $\rho$ on the group $\mathbb{D}_{10}$ as following: $\rho(r) = r^7, \rho(s) = r^5 s$. We can easily check $(\rho\circ\rho)(r) = r^{-1} = srs, (\rho\circ\rho)(s) = s = sss$, so $\rho\circ\rho$ is the conjugation by $s$. Therefore, although $\rho$ is not an exact $\mathbb{Z}_2$ automorphism on the group (only a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ outer automorphism), it still induces a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action on the representations, since representations are defined up to similarity transformations. The explicit action on the label set can be easily found:

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(B) = C, \rho_{\mathbf{g}}(X_1) = X_3, \rho_{\mathbf{g}}(X_2) = X_4. \tag{554}$$

One can check that the fusion rules and modular data are all invariant under this symmetry.

However, by directly checking the definition of the symmetry action, we find that this $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry is not fractionalizable. In other words, it is impossible to fractionalize the symmetry in a manner as described in Sec. IV. Therefore, the symmetry is obstructed. Notice that because the $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathbb{D}_{10})$ category is not modular, we can not directly relate the obstruction to an obstruction class in $H^3_\rho(G,\mathcal{A})$. However, the group automorphism can actually be turned into a topological $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry in the quantum double $\mathrm{D}(G)$, which restricts to the obstructed symmetry in the Rep category and therefore is also obstructed.


### Acknowledgments

We would like to thank M. Hermele, A. Kitaev, M. Metlitski, V. Ostrik, J. Slingerland, M. Titsworth, and K. Walker for enlightening discussions and especially X. Cui, C. Galindo, and J. Plavnik for sharing unpublished work. M.C. would like to thank Y.-Z. You for help on figures.

*Note added*: During the preparation of this manuscript, we learned of related unpublished works [168, 169].


### Appendix A: Review of Group Cohomology

In this appendix, we provide a brief review of group cohomology.

Given a finite group $G$, let $M$ be an Abelian group equipped with a $G$ action $\rho: G\to M$, which is compatible with group multiplication. In particular, for any $\mathbf{g}\in G$ and $a,b\in M$, we have

$$\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(ab) = \rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a)\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(b). \tag{A1}$$

(We leave the group multiplication symbols implicit.) Such an Abelian group $M$ with $G$ action $\rho$ is called a $G$-module.

Let $\omega(\mathbf{g}_1,\dots,\mathbf{g}_n)\in M$ be a function of $n$ group elements $\mathbf{g}_j\in G$ for $j=1,\dots,n$. Such a function is called a $n$-cochain and the set of all $n$-cochains is denoted as $C^n(G,M)$. They naturally form a group under multiplication,

$$(\omega\cdot\omega')(\mathbf{g}_1,\dots,\mathbf{g}_n) = \omega(\mathbf{g}_1,\dots,\mathbf{g}_n)\omega'(\mathbf{g}_1,\dots,\mathbf{g}_n), \tag{A2}$$

and the identity element is the trivial cochain $\omega(\mathbf{g}_1,\dots,\mathbf{g}_n)=1$.

We now define the "coboundary" map $\mathrm{d}: C^n(G,M)\to C^{n+1}(G,M)$ acting on cochains to be

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}\omega(\mathbf{g}_1,\dots,\mathbf{g}_{n+1}) &= \rho_{\mathbf{g}_1}[\omega(\mathbf{g}_2,\dots,\mathbf{g}_{n+1})]\\ &\times\prod_{j=1}^{n}\omega^{(-1)^j}(\mathbf{g}_1,\dots,\mathbf{g}_{j-1},\mathbf{g}_j\mathbf{g}_{j+1},\mathbf{g}_{j+1},\dots,\mathbf{g}_{n+1})\\ &\times\omega^{(-1)^{n+1}}(\mathbf{g}_1,\dots,\mathbf{g}_n).\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

One can directly verify that $\mathrm{dd}\omega = 1$ for any $\omega\in C^n(G,M)$, where 1 is the trivial cochain in $C^{n+2}(G,M)$. This is why $\mathrm{d}$ is considered a "boundary operator."

With the coboundary map, we next define $\omega\in C^n(G,M)$ to be an $n$-cocycle if it satisfies the condition $\mathrm{d}\omega = 1$. We denote the set of all $n$-cocycles by

$$\begin{aligned}Z^n_\rho(G,M) &= \ker[\mathrm{d}: C^n(G,M)\to C^{n+1}(G,M)]\\ &= \{\,\omega\in C^n(G,M)\mid \mathrm{d}\omega = 1\,\}.\end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

We also define $\omega\in C^n(G,M)$ to be an $n$-coboundary if it satisfies the condition $\omega = \mathrm{d}\mu$ for some $(n-1)$-cochain $\mu\in C^{n-1}(G,M)$. We denote the set of all $n$-coboundaries by Also we have

$$\begin{aligned}B^n_\rho(G,M) &= \mathrm{im}[\mathrm{d}: C^{n-1}(G,M)\to C^n(G,M)]\\ &= \{\,\omega\in C^n(G,M)\mid \exists\mu\in C^{n-1}(G,M): \omega = \mathrm{d}\mu\,\}.\end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

Clearly, $B^n_\rho(G,M)\subset Z^n_\rho(G,M)\subset C^n(G,M)$. In fact, $C^n$, $Z^n$, and $B^n$ are all groups and the co-boundary maps are homomorphisms. It is easy to see that $B^n_\rho(G,M)$ is a normal subgroup of $Z^n_\rho(G,M)$. Since $\mathrm{d}$ is a boundary map, we think of the $n$-coboundaries as being trivial $n$-cocycles, and it is natural to consider the quotient group

$$H^n_\rho(G,M) = \frac{Z^n_\rho(G,M)}{B^n_\rho(G,M)}, \tag{A6}$$

which is called the $n$-th cohomology group. In other words, $H^n_\rho(G,M)$ collects the equivalence classes of $n$-cocycles that only differ by $n$-coboundaries.

It is instructive to look at the lowest several cohomology groups. Let us first consider $H^1_\rho(G,M)$:

$$\begin{aligned}Z^1_\rho(G,M) &= \{\,\omega\mid \omega(\mathbf{g}_1)\rho_{\mathbf{g}}[\omega(\mathbf{g}_2)] = \omega(\mathbf{g}_1\mathbf{g}_2)\,\}\\ B^1_\rho(G,M) &= \{\,\omega\mid \omega(\mathbf{g}) = \rho_{\mathbf{g}}(\mu)\mu^{-1}\,\}.\end{aligned} \tag{A7}$$

If the $G$-action on $M$ is trivial, then $B^1_\rho(G,M) = \{1\}$ and $Z^1_\rho(G,M)$ is the group homomorphisms from $G$ to $M$. In general, $H^1_\rho(G,M)$ classifies "crossed group homomorphisms" from $G$ to $M$.

For the second cohomology, we have

$$\begin{aligned}Z^2_\rho(G,M) &= \{\,\omega\mid \rho_{\mathbf{g}_1}[\omega(\mathbf{g}_2,\mathbf{g}_3)]\omega(\mathbf{g}_1,\mathbf{g}_2\mathbf{g}_3)\\ &\qquad = \omega(\mathbf{g}_1,\mathbf{g}_2)\omega(\mathbf{g}_1\mathbf{g}_2,\mathbf{g}_3)\,\}\\ B^2_\rho(G,M) &= \{\,\omega\mid \omega(\mathbf{g}_1,\mathbf{g}_2) = \varepsilon(\mathbf{g}_1)\rho_{\mathbf{g}_1}[\varepsilon(\mathbf{g}_2)]\varepsilon^{-1}(\mathbf{g}_1\mathbf{g}_2)\,\}.\end{aligned} \tag{A8}$$

If $M = \mathrm{U}(1)$, it is well-known that $Z^2(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ is exactly the factor sets (also known as the Schur multipliers) of projective representations of $G$, with the cocycle condition coming from the requirement of associativity. $H^2(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ classifies all inequivalent projective representations of $G$.

For the third cohomology, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z^3_\rho(G, M) = \{\, \omega \mid \omega(\mathbf{g}_1\mathbf{g}_2, \mathbf{g}_3, \mathbf{g}_4)\omega(\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2, \mathbf{g}_3\mathbf{g}_4) \\ = \rho_{\mathbf{g}_1}[\omega(\mathbf{g}_2, \mathbf{g}_3, \mathbf{g}_4)]\omega(\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2\mathbf{g}_3, \mathbf{g}_4)\omega(\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2, \mathbf{g}_3)\,\} \end{aligned} \tag{A9}$$

For $M = \mathrm{U}(1)$ and trivial $G$ action, $Z^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ is the set of $F$-symbols for the fusion category $\mathrm{Vec}_G$, with the 3-cocycle condition being the Pentagon identity. $B^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ is identified with all the $F$-symbols that are gauge-equivalent to the trivial one. $H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ then classifies the gauge-equivalent classes of $F$-symbols on $\mathrm{Vec}_G$.

### Appendix B: Projective Representations of Finite Groups

We briefly summarize some basic results of the theory of projective representations of finite groups over the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$ and discuss the unitary case without loss of generality. For proofs, we refer the readers to Ref. [170].

Consider a finite group $G$ and a normalized 2-cocycle $\omega \in Z^2(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$. Suppose $V$ is a non-zero vector space over $\mathbb{C}$. A $\omega$-representation of $G$ over the vector space $V$ is a map $\pi : G \to \mathbf{GL}(V)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\mathbf{g})\pi(\mathbf{h}) = \omega(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h})\pi(\mathbf{gh}), \quad \forall \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h} \in G \\ \pi(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbb{1}. \end{aligned} \tag{B1}$$

We denote the $\omega$-projective representative by a triple $(\omega, \pi, V)$, or for brevity $(\pi, V)$ or simply $\pi$ below. Also $n_\pi \equiv \dim V$.

Two $\omega$-representations $(\pi_1, V_1)$ and $(\pi_2, V_2)$ are $\omega$-isomorphic, denoted as $\pi_1 \sim_\omega \pi_2$, if and only if there exits an isomorphism $S$ between $V_1$ and $V_2$ such that $S\pi_1(\mathbf{g})S^{-1} = \pi_2(\mathbf{g}), \forall \mathbf{g} \in G$.

Given two $\omega$-representations $(\pi_1, V_1)$ and $(\pi_2, V_2)$, we can form their direct sum, which is a $\omega$-representation of $G$ over $V_1 \oplus V_2$. In matrix form, we have

$$(\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2)(\mathbf{g}) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \pi_1(\mathbf{g}) & 0 \\ 0 & \pi_2(\mathbf{g}) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{B2}$$

Clearly $\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2$ also has the same factor set $\omega$. However, there is no natural way of defining a direct sum of a $\omega$-representation and a $\omega'$-representation when $\omega \neq \omega'$.

One can also define a tensor product of two projective representations. Given two projective representations $(\omega_1, \pi_1, V_1)$ and $(\omega_2, \pi_2, V_2)$, their tensor product $\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2$ is defined as $(\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2)(\mathbf{g}) = \pi_1(\mathbf{g}) \otimes \pi_2(\mathbf{g})$ over the vector space $V_1 \otimes V_2$. The factor set of the tensor product $\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2$ is $\omega_1\omega_2$.

Similar to linear representations, one can define reducible and irreducible projective representations. A projective representation $(\omega, \pi, V)$ is called irreducible if the vector space $V$ has no invariant subspace under the map $\pi$ other than 0 or $V$. A projective representation is reducible if it is not irreducible. A reducible projective representation always decomposes into a direct sum of irreducible projective representations with the same factor set.

Given a projective representation $\pi$ of $G$, its character $\chi_\pi : G \to \mathbb{C}$ is defined to be

$$\chi_\pi(\mathbf{g}) = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\pi(\mathbf{g})\right]. \tag{B3}$$

It follows that

$$\chi_\pi(\mathbf{0}) = n_\pi \tag{B4}$$

$$\chi_\pi(\mathbf{g}^{-1}) = \omega(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^{-1})\chi^*_\pi(\mathbf{g}) \tag{B5}$$

where we use the identity $\omega(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^{-1}) = \omega(\mathbf{g}^{-1}, \mathbf{g})$.

Another more nontrivial relation is

$$\chi_\pi(\mathbf{hgh}^{-1}) = \frac{\omega(\mathbf{h}^{-1}, \mathbf{hgh^{-1}})}{\omega(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}^{-1})}\chi_\pi(\mathbf{g}), \tag{B6}$$

which reveals an important difference between projective and regular characters, because regular characters depend only on the conjugacy classes.

Given two $\omega$-representations $\pi_1$ and $\pi_2$, obviously, one has $\chi_{\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2} = \chi_{\pi_1} + \chi_{\pi_2}$ and $\chi_{\pi_1 \otimes \chi_2} = \chi_{\pi_1}\chi_{\pi_2}$.

As in the theory of linear representations, characters are important because they distinguish the isomorphism classes of irreducible projective representations:

*Two $\omega$-representations are $\omega$-isomorphic if and only if they have the same character.*

Analogous to the familiar character theory of linear representations, one can show that the projective characters satisfy some orthogonality relations. We give the first orthogonality relation here and discuss the second one later. For two irreducible $\omega$-representations $\pi_1$ and $\pi_2$, we have

$$\frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{\mathbf{g}\in G} \chi_{\pi_1}(\mathbf{g})\chi^*_{\pi_2}(\mathbf{g}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad \pi_1 \sim_\omega \pi_2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{B7}$$

One can use the characters to decompose projective representations. Namely, fix a factor set $\omega$, let $\pi$ be a projective representation (not necessarily irreducible) of $G$ and $\pi'$ an irreducible projective representation. The multiplicity of $\pi'$ in $\pi$ can be computed by

$$m(\pi', \pi) = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{\mathbf{g}\in G} \chi_{\pi'}(\mathbf{g})\chi^*_\pi(\mathbf{g}). \tag{B8}$$

In general, given two $\omega$-representations $\pi$ and $\pi'$ (neither of which is necessarily irreducible), we define the multiplicity $m(\pi', \pi)$ as

$$m(\pi', \pi) = \dim \mathrm{Hom}_G(V_{\pi'}, V_\pi). \tag{B9}$$

Here $\mathrm{Hom}_G(V_{\pi'}, V_\pi)$ is the space of intertwining operators, i.e. linear maps between $V_{\pi'}$ and $V_\pi$ which commute with the $G$ actions. Note that the $G$ action on $V_\pi$ is given exactly by the representation $\pi$. Schur's lemma implies that if $\pi$ is an irrep,

then $\mathrm{Hom}_G(V_\pi, V_\pi) = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{1}_{V_\pi}$, i.e. all intertwiners are scalar multiplications. If $\pi$ and $\pi'$ are irreducible representations that are not isomorphic, then $\mathrm{Hom}_G(V_\pi, V_{\pi'}) = 0$. Therefore, given two $\omega$-representations $\pi$ and $\pi'$, we can decompose them into the direct sum of $\omega$-irreps: $\pi = \oplus_i N_i \pi_i, \pi' = \oplus_i N_i' \pi_i$, where $\pi_i$ is the complete set of $\omega$-irreps and $N_i, N_i'$ are multiplicities, respectively. Then a general intertwiner $\Phi \in \mathrm{Hom}_G(V_{\pi'}, V_\pi)$ is of the form

$$\Phi = \bigoplus_i (M_i \otimes \mathbb{1}_{V_{\pi_i}}). \tag{B10}$$

Here $M_i$ is a linear map between $\mathbb{C}^{N_i}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{N_i'}$, i.e. an $N_i \times N_i'$ complex matrix, which can be thought as a vector in an $N_i N_i'$-dimensional complex vector space. It follows that

$$\dim \mathrm{Hom}_G(V_{\pi'}, V_\pi) = \sum_i N_i N_i'. \tag{B11}$$

For applications, we can show that Eq. (B8) applies to the general case, too.

A special projective representation, the $\omega$-regular representation, is defined as $R(\mathbf{g})e_{\mathbf{h}} = \omega(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h})e_{\mathbf{gh}}$, where $\{e_{\mathbf{g}} | \mathbf{g} \in G\}$ is a basis for a $|G|$-dimensional vector space. Its character $\chi_R(\mathbf{g}) = |G|\delta_{\mathbf{g0}}$. Using Eq. (B8), we see that the $\omega$-regular representation is reducible and each irreducible projective representation $\pi$ appears exactly $n_\pi$ times in its decomposition. Consequently, we have the following two relations

$$\sum_\pi n_\pi^2 = |G|, \quad \sum_\pi n_\pi \chi_\pi(\mathbf{g}) = |G|\delta_{\mathbf{g0}}. \tag{B12}$$

The sum is over all irreducible $\omega$-projective representations $\pi$.

An element $\mathbf{g} \in G$ is called an $\omega$-regular element if and only if $\omega(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}) = \omega(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{g})$ for all $\mathbf{h} \in N_{\mathbf{g}}$, where $N_{\mathbf{g}}$ is the centralizer of $\mathbf{g}$ in $G$. Moreover, $\mathbf{g}$ is $\omega$-regular if and only if all elements in its conjugacy class $[\mathbf{g}]$ are $\omega$-regular. This property follows from the 2-cocycle condition.

Now consider $\mathbf{h} \in N_{\mathbf{g}}$, so

$$\chi_\pi(\mathbf{g}) = \chi_\pi(\mathbf{h^{-1}gh}) = \frac{\omega(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{g})}{\omega(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h})} \chi_\pi(\mathbf{g}) \tag{B13}$$

Therefore, if $\mathbf{g}$ is not $\omega$-regular, $\chi_\pi(\mathbf{g}) = 0$. In fact, one can show that an element $\mathbf{g}$ is $\omega$-regular if and only if $\chi_\pi(\mathbf{g}) \neq 0$ for some irreducible representation $\pi$.

We then have the following important result:

*Fix a factor set $\omega$. The number of non-isomorphic irreducible projective $\omega$-representations of $G$ is equal to the number of $\omega$-regular conjugacy classes of $G$.*

We can now state the second orthogonality relation: Let $\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2, \ldots$ be a complete set of representatives for $\omega$-regular classes of $G$. For any two $\omega$-regular elements $\mathbf{g_i}$ and $\mathbf{g_j}$,

$$\sum_\pi \chi_\pi(\mathbf{g}_i) \chi_\pi^*(\mathbf{g}_j) = |N_{\mathbf{g}_i}| \delta_{ij}. \tag{B14}$$

The sum is over all irreducible $\omega$-projective representations $\pi$.

If two factor sets $\omega$ and $\omega'$ belong to the same equivalence class in $H^2(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$, then we have

$$\omega'(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}) = \frac{\mu(\mathbf{g})\mu(\mathbf{h})}{\mu(\mathbf{gh})} \omega(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}) \tag{B15}$$

for some $\mu(\mathbf{g}) : G \to \mathrm{U}(1)$ with $\mu(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbb{1}$.

Given a $\mu$ as above and an irreducible $\omega$-projective representation $\pi$, we can then construct another $\omega'$-projective representation $\pi'(\mathbf{g}) = \mu(\mathbf{g})\pi(\mathbf{g})$. Clearly, the two procedures above define a one-to-one correspondence. Their characters also differ by $\mu$, that is $\chi_{\pi'}(\mathbf{g}) = \mu(\mathbf{g})\chi_\pi(\mathbf{g})$.

## Appendix C: $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(w)}$ and Ising$^{(\nu)}$ Anyon Models

The $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(w)}$ anyon model for $N$ a positive integer can have $w \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $N$ and $w \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$ for $N$ even. It has $N$ topological charges labeled by $a = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1$ which obey the fusion rules $a \times b = [a+b]_N$. The $F$-symbols are

$$[F^{abc}_{[a+b+c]_N}]_{[a+b]_N, [b+c]_N} = e^{\frac{2\pi i w}{N} a(b+c-[b+c]_N)}. \tag{C1}$$

Notice that they are all 1 when $w \in \mathbb{Z}$. For $w \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$, some of the $F$-symbols are equal to $-1$ which can not be gauged away in general.

The $R$-symbols are

$$R^{ab}_{[a+b]_N} = e^{\frac{2\pi i w}{N} ab}. \tag{C2}$$

The twist factors are $\theta_a = e^{\frac{2\pi i w}{N} a^2}$.

Notice that $w$ is periodic in $N$. For odd $N$, $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(w)}$ are modular except $w = 0$. For even $N$, $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(w)}$ are modular only for $w \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$.

The anyon model Ising$^{(\nu)}$ where $\nu$ is an odd integer has three topological charges $\{I, \sigma, \psi\}$, where the vacuum charge here is denoted $I$, and the nontrivial fusion rules are given by

$$\psi \times \psi = I, \quad \sigma \times \psi = \sigma, \quad \sigma \times \sigma = I + \psi. \tag{C3}$$

The nontrivial $F$-symbols are

$$\begin{aligned} F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi} &= F_\psi^{\sigma\psi\sigma} = -1 \\ [F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{ab} &= \frac{\varkappa_\sigma}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}_{ab} \end{aligned} \tag{C4}$$

Here the column and row values of the matrix take value $I$ and $\psi$ (in this order). $\varkappa_\sigma = (-1)^{\frac{\nu^2-1}{8}}$ is the Frobenius-Schur indicator of $\sigma$.

The $R$-symbols are

$$\begin{aligned} R_\sigma^{\psi\sigma} &= R_\sigma^{\sigma\psi} = (-i)^\nu \\ R_I^{\sigma\sigma} &= \varkappa_\sigma e^{-i\frac{\pi\nu}{8}}, \quad R_\psi^{\sigma\sigma} = \varkappa_\sigma e^{i\frac{3\pi\nu}{8}}. \end{aligned} \tag{C5}$$

The twist factor $\theta_\sigma = e^{i\frac{\pi\nu}{8}}$ uniquely distinguishes the eight distinct Ising$^{(\nu)}$ anyon models, as does the chiral central charge $c_- \bmod 8 = \frac{\nu}{2}$.

The Ising TQFT corresponds to $\nu = 1$, $\mathrm{SU}(2)_2$ corresponds to $\nu = 3$, and $\nu \geq 5$ can be realized in $\mathrm{SO}(\nu)_1$ Chern-Simons field theory.

## Appendix D: Categorical Formulation of Symmetry, Defects, and Gauging

In this appendix, $G$ will always denote a finite group and $\mathcal{C}$ a unitary modular tensor category (UMTC) unless otherwise stated explicitly. Also $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ below is $\mathrm{Aut}_{0,0}(\mathcal{C})$ in the main text. For a category $\mathcal{C}$, $x \in \mathcal{C}$ means that $x$ is an object of $\mathcal{C}$, and $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is the complex conjugate category of $\mathcal{C}$. The materials in this appendix are distilled from Refs. [80–82, 101, 139, 165].

### 1. Categorical Topological and Global Symmetry

A categorical-group $\mathcal{G}$ is a monoidal category $\mathcal{G}$ whose objects and morphisms are all invertible. The complete invariant of a categorical-group $\mathcal{G}$ is the triple $(\pi_1(\mathcal{G}), \pi_2(\mathcal{G}), \phi(\mathcal{G}))$, where $\pi_1(\mathcal{G})$ is the group of the isomorphism classes of objects of $\mathcal{G}$, $\pi_2(\mathcal{G})$ the abelian group of the automorphisms of the tensor unit $\mathbf{1}$ of $\mathcal{G}$, and $\phi(\mathcal{G}) \in H^3(\pi_1(\mathcal{G}); \pi_2(\mathcal{G}))$ the group 3-cocyle that represents the associativity of the tensor product $\otimes$ of $\mathcal{G}$ ($\pi_1(\mathcal{G})$ acts on $\pi_2(\mathcal{G})$ and they form a cross module as the notation suggests) [171].

A group $G$ can be promoted to a categorical-group $\underline{G}$ as follows: the objects of $\underline{G}$ are the group elements of $G$, and the morphism set $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h})$ of two objects $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}$ is empty if $\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{h}$ and contains only the identity if $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{h}$. We will use $\underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$ to denote the categorical-group of braided tensor autoequivalences of $\mathcal{C}$. The tensor product of two braided tensor autoequivalences is their composition. The morphism between two braided tensor autoequivalences are the natural isomorphisms between the two functors. We will call $\underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$ the categorical topological symmetry group of $\mathcal{C}$.

Given a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$, $\pi_2(\mathcal{C})$, i.e. $\pi_2(\mathcal{G})$ for $\mathcal{G} = \underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$, is isomorphic to the group of the invertible object classes of $\mathcal{C}$ as an abstract finite abelian group, which we denote by $\mathcal{A}$ in the main text, but the finite group $\pi_1(\mathcal{C})$, i.e. $\pi_1(\mathcal{G})$ for $\mathcal{G} = \underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$, is difficult to determine in general except for abelian modular categories.

We will also use $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ to denote $\pi_1(\mathcal{C})$: the group of equivalence classes of braided tensor autoequivalences of $\mathcal{C}$. This ordinary group is the demotion (or decategorification) of the categorical-group $\underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$ and is called the topological symmetry of $\mathcal{C}$.

**Definition 1.** *Given a group $G$, a monoidal functor $\underline{\rho} : \underline{G} \to \underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$ is called a categorical global symmetry of $\mathcal{C}$.*

*We will denote the categorical global symmetry as $(\underline{\rho}, G)$ or simply $\underline{\rho}$ and say that $G$ acts categorically on $\mathcal{C}$.*

*A categorical global symmetry can be demoted to a group homomorphism $\rho : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$, which is called a global symmetry of $\mathcal{C}$.*

To understand a categorical-group action $G$ on a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$, we will start with a global symmetry $\rho : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$. It is not true that we can always lift such a group homomorphism to a categorical-group functor $\underline{\rho}$. The obstruction for the existence of such a lifting is the pull-back group cohomology class $\rho^*(\phi(\mathcal{C})) \in H^3(G; \pi_2(\mathcal{C}))$ of $\phi(\mathcal{C}) \in H^3(\pi_1(\mathcal{C}), \pi_2(\mathcal{C}))$ by $\rho$. If this obstruction class does not vanish, then $G$ cannot act categorically on $\mathcal{C}$ so that the decategorified homomorphism is $\rho$. If this obstruction does vanish, then there are liftings of $\rho$ to categorical-group actions, but such liftings are not necessarily unique. The equivalence classes of all liftings form a torsor over $H^2_\rho(G, \pi_2(\mathcal{C}))$. We will denote the categorical global symmetry $\underline{\rho}$ also by a pair $(\rho, \mathbf{t})$, where $\rho : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathbf{t} \in H^2_\rho(G, \pi_2(\mathcal{C}))$.

### 2. Symmetry Defects

A module category $\mathcal{M}$ over a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$ is a categorical representation of $\mathcal{C}$. A left module category $\mathcal{M}$ over $\mathcal{C}$ is a semi-simple category with a bi-functor $\alpha_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ that satisfies the analogues of pentagons and the unit axiom. Similarly for a right module category. A bi-module category is a simultaneously left and right module category such that the left and right actions are compatible. Bi-module categories can be tensored together just like bi-modules over algebras. When $\mathcal{C}$ is braided, a left module category naturally becomes a bi-module category by using the braiding. A bi-module category $\mathcal{M}$ over $\mathcal{C}$ is invertible if there is another bi-module category $\mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \boxtimes \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{N} \boxtimes \mathcal{M}$ are both equivalent to $\mathcal{C}$—the trivial bi-module category over $\mathcal{C}$. The invertible (left) module categories over a modular category $\mathcal{C}$ form the Picard categorical-group $\underline{\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{C})}$ of $\mathcal{C}$. The Picard categorical-group $\underline{\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{C})}$ of a modular category $\mathcal{C}$ is monoidally equivalent to the categorical-group $\underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$ [81]. This one-one correspondence between braided auto-equivalences and invertible module categories is an important relation between symmetry and extrinsic topological defects.

Given a categorical global symmetry $(\underline{\rho}, G)$ of a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$ and an isomorphism of categorical groups $\underline{\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{C})}$ with $\underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$, then each $\underline{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}} \in \underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$ corresponds to an invertible bi-module category $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}} \in \underline{\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{C})}$.

**Definition 2.** *An extrinsic topological defect of flux $\mathbf{g} \in G$ is a simple object in the invertible module category $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}} \in \underline{\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{C})}$ over $\mathcal{C}$ corresponding to the braided tensor autoequivalence $\underline{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}} \in \underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$.*

The analogue of the Picard categorical-group of a modular category for a fusion category $\mathcal{C}$ is the Brauer-Picard categorical-group of invertible bi-module categories over $\mathcal{C}$. But invertible bi-module categories over a fusion category $\mathcal{C}$ is in one-one correspondence with braided auto-equivalences of the Drinfeld center $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C})$ of $\mathcal{C}$ (also known as the quantum double of $\mathcal{C}$ in physics literature) [81], not tensor auto-equivalences of $\mathcal{C}$ itself. When $\mathcal{C}$ is modular, then $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}) \cong \mathcal{C} \otimes \overline{\mathcal{C}}$. Note that $\underline{\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{C})}$ is naturally included in the Brauer-Picard group of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$ included naturally in the categorical-group of braided tensor auto-equivalences of $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C})$. The images of the two inclusions intersect trivially.

The topological defects in the $\mathbf{g}$-flux sector form an invertible bi-module category $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ over the UMTC $\mathcal{C}$. Defects can be fused and their fusion corresponds to the tensor product of bi-module categories. Since all defects arise from the

same physics, fusions of defects for all flux sectors should be consistent. Such a consistency is encoded as the collection $\{\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}\}, \mathbf{g} \in G$ of flux sectors gives rise to an extension of $\mathcal{C}$ to a unitary $G$-crossed modular category. Given a categorical global symmetry $(\rho, \mathbf{t})$, it is not always possible to define defect fusions so that we could obtain such an extension. Given fluxes $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}$, we need to choose an identification $M_{\mathbf{gh}} : \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{h} \cong \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}$. For four fluxes $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} \in G$, the two paths of the pentagon using the $\{M_{\mathbf{gh}}\}$'s to identify $((\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{h}) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{k}) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{l}$ with $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g} \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{h} \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{k} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{l}))$ could differ by a phase. The collection of those phases forms a cohomology class in $H^4(G; \mathrm{U}(1))$, which is the obstruction class to consistent pentagons for the flux sectors. If this obstruction class vanishes, then we need to choose a group cohomology class $\alpha \in H^3(G; \mathrm{U}(1))$ to specify the associativity of the flux sectors. A subtle point here is that the consistency requirement via pentagons for flux sectors $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$ is strictly stronger than that for all defects separately.

Given a triple $(\rho, \mathbf{t}, \alpha)$ as above when the obstruction class in $H^4(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ vanishes, where $(\rho, \mathbf{t})$ is a categorical global symmetry and $\alpha \in H^3(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$ specifies associtivity of the flux sectors, we can construct a $G$-crossed modular extension of $\mathcal{C}$, which describes the extrinsic topological defects of $\mathcal{C}$. In the following, we will call such a triple $(\rho, \mathbf{t}, \alpha)$ *a gauging data*. The extension $\mathcal{C}_G^\times = \mathcal{C}_{(\rho,\mathbf{t},\alpha)} = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{g}\in G} \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$ of $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ is a unitary $G$-crossed modular category—a unitary $G$-crossed fusion category with a compatible non-degenerate $G$-braiding.

A $G$-grading of a fusion category $\mathcal{C}$ is a decomposition of $\mathcal{C}$ into $\bigoplus_{\mathbf{g}\in G} \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$. We will consider only faithful $G$-gradings so that none of the components $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g} = 0$. The tensor product respects the grading in the sense $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{h} \subset \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}$. Since $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}^{-1}}$ is the inverse of $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$, $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$ is naturally an invertible bi-module category over $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$, where $\mathbf{0} \in G$ is the identity element. A categorical action $\rho$ of $G$ on $\mathcal{C}$ is compatible with the grading if $\underline{\rho}(\mathbf{g})\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{h} \subset \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{ghg}^{-1}}$. A $G$-graded fusion category $\mathcal{C}$ with a compatible $G$-action is called a $G$-crossed fusion category.

Suppose $\mathcal{C}_G^\times = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{g}\in G} \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$ is an extension of a unitary fusion category $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$, i.e. $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ is a unitary $G$-crossed fusion category. Let $I_\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g} \in G$ be the set of isomorphism classes of simple objects in $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}) = \{X_i\}_{i\in I_\mathbf{g}}$ be a set of representatives of simple objects of $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$. The cardinality of $I_\mathbf{g}$ is called the rank of the component $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$, and $\mathcal{D}_\mathbf{g} = \sqrt{\sum_{i\in I_\mathbf{g}} d_i^2}$ is the total quantum dimension of component $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$, where $d_i$ is the quantum dimension of $X_i \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g})$.

**Theorem D.1** ([80, 82])**.** *Let $\mathcal{C} = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{g}\in G} \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$ be an extension of a unitary fusion category $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$. Then*

1. *The rank of $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$ is the number of fixed points of the action of $\mathbf{g}$ on $I_\mathbf{0}$.*
2. *$\mathcal{D}_\mathbf{g}^2 = \mathcal{D}_\mathbf{h}^2$ for all $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h} \in G$.*

The extension $\mathcal{C}_G^\times = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{g}\in G} \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$ of a UMTC $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{0}$ for the symmetry $(\rho, \mathbf{t})$, while not braided in general, has a $G$-crossed braiding. Given a $G$-crossed fusion category $\mathcal{C}$ with categorical $G$-action $\underline{\rho}$, we will denote $\underline{\rho_\mathbf{g}}(Y)$ for an object $Y$ of $\mathcal{C}$ by ${}^\mathbf{g}Y$. A $G$-braiding is a collection of natural isomorphisms $c_{X,Y} : X \otimes Y \to {}^\mathbf{g}Y \otimes X$ for all $X \in \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}, Y \in \mathcal{C}$, which satisfies a generalization of the Hexagon equations.

A UMTC is a unitary fusion category with a non-degenerate braiding. A unitary $G$-crossed modular category is a unitary $G$-crossed fusion category with a non-degenerate $G$-braiding. An easy way to define non-degeneracy of braiding is through the non-degeneracy of the modular $S$-matrix. To define the non-degeneracy of the $G$-crossed braiding, we will introduce the extended $G$-crossed $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ operators on an extended Verlinde algebra. Likewise, the extended $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ operators will give rise to a projective representation of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbf{Z})$. We believe that the $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ operators will determine the unitary $G$-crossed modular category $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$.

**Theorem D.2** ([81])**.** *The unitary $G$-crossed fusion category extension $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ of a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$ has a canonical $G$-braiding and categorical $G$-action that make $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ into a unitary $G$-crossed modular category.*

Given a categorical global symmetry $\underline{\rho} : \underline{G} \to \underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$ of a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$, an extension of $\mathcal{C}$ to a non-degenerate braided fusion category corresponds to a lifting of $\underline{\rho}$ to a categorical 2-group functor $\underline{\underline{\rho}} : \underline{\underline{G}} \to \underline{\underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}}$. The existence of such liftings has an obstruction in $\overline{\overline{H^4(G; \mathrm{U}(1))}}$, which is the same as the obstruction for solving pentagons of flux sectors. When the obstruction class vanishes, the choices correspond to cohomology classes in $H^3(G; \mathrm{U}(1))$. If we choose a cohomology class $\alpha \in H^3(G; \mathrm{U}(1))$, then we have a lifting to a categorical 2-group morphism. Since all other higher obstruction classes vanish, the categorical global symmetry can be lifted to a morphism of any higher categorical number. As extended $G$-action and $G$-braiding are higher categorical-number morphisms, so they can always be lifted. Furthermore, since all higher obstruction classes vanish, the liftings are unique.

To see the $G$-action and $G$-crossed braiding concretely, consider the functor category $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}, \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}})$. On one hand, this category can be identified as $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{h}$ by $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{h} \cong \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}$, and on the other hand, as $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{ghg}^{-1}}$ by $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{ghg}^{-1}} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g} \cong \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{gh}}$. Therefore, we have an isomorphism $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g} \cong \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{ghg}^{-1}}$. This defines an extended action of $G$ on $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$. By the same consideration, we have $\mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{h} \cong \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{ghg}^{-1}} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_\mathbf{g}$. This defines the $G$-crossed braiding of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$.

To define the extended $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}$-operators, we first define an extended Verlinde algebra. For each pair $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}$ of commuting elements of $G$, we define the following extended Verlinde algebra component: $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(\mathcal{C}) = \bigoplus_{i\in I_\mathbf{h}} \mathrm{Hom}(X_i, {}^\mathbf{g}X_i)$.

Then the extended Verline algebra is

$$\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{C}) = \bigoplus_{\{(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})|\mathbf{gh}=\mathbf{hg}\}} \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}(\mathcal{C}).$$

Note that $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}}$ is the Verlinde algebra of $\mathcal{C}$, which has a canonical basis given by the identity morphisms of $\mathrm{Hom}(X_i, X_i), i \in I_\mathbf{0}$. Unlike the usual Verlinde algebra of $\mathcal{C}$, the extended Verlinde algebra does not have such canonical basis. One choice of basis is $\underline{\rho_\mathbf{g}} : X_i \to {}^\mathbf{g}X_i$, and they will give rise to extended $G$-crossed $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ transformations. However, this depends on the choice of cocycle representative of $\alpha$. Therefore, the extended $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ operators are not

canonically matrices. We call a $G$-crossed braided spherical fusion category $G$-crossed modular if the extended $\mathcal{S}$ operator is invertible.

### 3. Gauging Categorical Global Symmetry

Let $\underline{\underline{G}}$ be the promotion of a group $G$ to a categorical 2-group, and $\underline{\underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}}$ be the categorical 2-group of braided tensor auto-equivalences.

**Definition 3.** *A categorical global symmetry $\underline{\rho} : \underline{G} \to \underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}$ can be gauged if $\underline{\rho}$ can be lifted to a categorical 2-group functor $\underline{\underline{\rho}} : \underline{\underline{G}} \to \underline{\underline{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{C})}}$.*

Given a categorical global symmetry $(\underline{\rho}, G)$ of a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$, gauging $G$ is possible only when the obstruction as above in $H^4(G; \mathrm{U}(1))$ vanishes. Then the gauging result in general depends on a gauging data $(\rho, \mathtt{t}, \alpha)$. Given a gauging data $(\rho, \mathtt{t}, \alpha)$, gauging is defined as the following two-step process: first extend $\mathcal{C}$ to a unitary $G$-crossed modular category $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ with a categorical $G$ action; Then perform the equivariantization of the categorical $G$ action on $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$, which results in a UMTC $(\mathcal{C}_G^\times)^G$, also simply denoted as $\mathcal{C}/G$. The "bosonic" symmetric category $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$ is always contained in $\mathcal{C}/G$ as a Tannakian subcategory. Therefore, gauging actually leads to a pair $\mathrm{Rep}(G) \subset \mathcal{C}/G$.

Suppose $\mathcal{C}$ is a fusion category with a $G$ action. The equivariantization of $\mathcal{C}$, denoted as $\mathcal{C}^G$, is also called orbifolding. The result of equivariantization of a $G$-action on a fusion category $\mathcal{C}$ is a fusion category whose objects are $(X, \{\phi_{\mathbf{g}}\}_{\mathbf{g}\in G})$, where $X$ is an object of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\phi_{\mathbf{g}} : {}^{\mathbf{g}}X \to X$ an isomorphism such that $\phi_{\mathbf{0}} = \mathrm{id}$ and $\phi_{\mathbf{g}} \cdot \underline{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}}(\phi_{\mathbf{h}}) = \phi_{\mathbf{gh}} \cdot \kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$, where $\kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$ identifies $\underline{\rho_{\mathbf{h}}} \cdot \underline{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}}$ with $\underline{\rho_{\mathbf{gh}}}$. Morphisms between two objects $(X, \{\phi_{\mathbf{g}}\}_{\mathbf{g}\in G})$ and $(Y, \{\psi_{\mathbf{g}}\}_{\mathbf{g}\in G})$ are morphisms $f : X \to Y$ such that $f \cdot \phi_{\mathbf{g}} = \phi_{\mathbf{h}} \cdot \underline{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}}(f)$.

The simple objects of $\mathcal{C}^G$ are parameterized by pairs $([X], \pi_X)$, where $[X]$ is an orbit of the $G$-action on simple objects of $\mathcal{C}$, and $\pi_X$ is an irreducible projective representation of $G_X$—the stabilizer group of $X$. The quantum dimension of $([X], \pi_X)$ is $\dim(\pi_X) \cdot N_{[X]} \cdot d_X$, where $N_{[X]}$ is the size of the orbit $[X]$. Fusion rules can be similarly described using algebraic data [83].

In general, gauging is difficult to perform explicitly. The first extension step is very difficult. The second equivariantization step is easier if the $6j$-symbols of the gauged UMTC $\mathcal{C}/G$ are not required explicitly. Different triples of gauging data might lead to the same gauged UMTC.

Gauging has an inverse process, which is the condensation of anyons in the Tannakian subcategory $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$. This condensation process is mathematically called taking the core of the pair $\mathrm{Rep}(G) \subset \mathcal{C}/G$ [139]. Taking a core is a powerful method to verify a guess for gauging because anyon condensation is sometimes easier to carry out than gauging.

When $\mathcal{C}$ is a $G$-crossed modular category with faithful grading, then its equivariantization is also modular and vise versa [80]. There is the forgetful functor $F : \mathcal{C}^G \to \mathcal{C}$ by $F(X, \{\phi_{\mathbf{g}}\}_{\mathbf{g}\in G}) = X$ and its adjoint $G(X) = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{g}\in G}({}^{\mathbf{g}}X, \{(\mu_X)_{\mathbf{g}}\})$, where $(\mu_X)_{\mathbf{g}} = \kappa_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}}$. They intertwine the extended $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}$ operators.

Our equivariantization in gauging is applied to a $G$-crossed extension $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ of a modular category $\mathcal{C}$. When $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ has a faithful grading, then the non-degeneracy of the braiding of $\mathcal{C}$ is equivalent to the non-degeneracy of the braiding of $\mathcal{C}_G^\times$ [139].

### 4. General Properties of Gauging

Gauging and its inverse – condensation of anyons – are interesting constructions of new modular categories from old ones. The resulted new modular categories have many interesting relations with the old ones.

**Theorem D.3** ([139])**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a UMTC with a categorical global symmetry $(\rho, G)$. Then $\mathcal{C} \otimes \overline{\mathcal{C}/G} \cong \mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}_G^\times)$.*

*It follows that*

1. *Chiral topological central charge is invariant under gauging (mod 8).*
2. *The total quantum dimension $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}/G} = |G|\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}}$.*

The following theorem says that gauging a quantum double results in a quantum double.

**Theorem D.4.** *Suppose $G$ acts categorically on $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C})$. Then $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C})/G = \mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}_G^\times)$.*

When the symmetry group $G$ has a normal subgroup $N$, then we can first gauge $N$, and then gauge their quotient $H = G/N$. This sequentially gauging is useful for gauging non-abelian groups $G$ such as $S_3$.

**Theorem D.5.** *Let $\rho : \underline{\underline{G}} \longrightarrow \underline{\underline{\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{C})}}$, then there exist $\rho_1 : \underline{\underline{N}} \longrightarrow \underline{\underline{\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{C})}}$, $\rho_2 : \underline{\underline{H}} \longrightarrow \underline{\underline{\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{C}/N)}}$, such that $(\mathcal{C}/N)/H$ is braided equivalent to $\mathcal{C}/G$.*

Proofs of Theorems D.4 and D.5 will appear in Ref. [165].

The construction from a modular category $\mathcal{C}$ with a $G$-action to a modular category $\mathcal{C}/G$ with a Tannakian subcategory $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$ by gauging can be regarded as a new way to construct interesting modular categories in the same Witt class. When $\mathcal{C}$ is weakly integral, then the gauged category $\mathcal{C}/G$ is also weakly integral. The inverse process of condensation implies that pairs $(\mathcal{C}, \underline{\rho})$ and $(\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Rep}(G))$ are in one-one correspondence.

### 5. New Mathematical Results

In higher category theory, it is common practice to strictify categories as much as possible by turning natural isomorphisms into identities. This is desirable because strictification simplifies many computations and does not lose any generality when we are interested in gauge invariant quantities in classification problems. The drawback is that we have to work with many objects. In this paper, our preference is the opposite,

in the sense that we would like to work with as few objects as possible. Hence, our goal is to have a skeletal formulation with full computational power, so that we can calculate numerical quantities, such as amplitudes of quantum processes, which are not necessarily gauge invariant. A category is skeletal if there is only one object in each isomorphism class, and in general strictness and skeletalness cannot be obtained simultaneously, as may be demonstrated, for example, by the semion theory $\mathcal{Z}_2^{(1/2)}$. Therefore, we need to skeletonize the existing mathematical theories. The situation is analogous to the one of a connection or gauge field: mathematically it is good to define a connection as a horizontal distribution, while, in practice, it is better to work with Christoffel symbols, especially in physics.

Our first mathematical result is a skeletonization of $G$-crossed braided fusion category in Sec. VI. We provide a definition of a $G$-crossed braided category using a collection of quantities organized into a basic data set: $N_{ab}^c, F_d^{abc}, R_c^{ab}, U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,b;c)$, and $\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$ that satisfy certain consistency polynomial equations. The fusion coefficients $N_{ab}^c$ and associativity $F$-symbols $F_d^{abc}$ are as usual, but the $R$-symbols $R_c^{ab}$ are extended to incorporate the $G$-crossed structure. The new data $U_{\mathbf{k}}(a,b;c)$ and $\eta_x(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})$, respectively encode the categorical symmetry: monoidal functors and natural identifications $\rho_{\mathbf{gh}}$ with $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}\rho_{\mathbf{h}}$. A good example of new consistency equations are our $G$-crossed Heptagon Eqs. (272) and (273), which generalize the usual Hexagon equations.

Our numericalization of a $G$-crossed braided fusion category provides the full computational power for any theory using diagrammatical recouplings, though care has to be taken when strands pass over/under local extremals. This computational tool is especially useful for dealing with gauge-dependent quantities, which, in the $G$-crossed theory, include the important extended $G$-crossed modular $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ transformations. As an application, we generalize the Verlinde formulas to the $G$-crossed Verlinde formulas Eqs. (331) and (332). The diagrammatical recouplings also allow us to prove the theorems mentioned above in an elementary way. In particular, we prove that the extended $G$-crossed modular $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ transformations indeed give rise to projective representations of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$. We also conjecture the topological twists for the gauged (equivariantized) theory and derive the modular $S$-matrix of the gauged theory.

In Sec. X, we catalog many examples. Those examples illustrate our theory and also potentially lead to new modular categories. An interesting example is the gauging of the $S_3$-symmetry of the three-fermion theory $\mathrm{SO}(8)_1$. The resulting rank 12 weakly integral modular tensor category has not previously appeared in the literature. It would be interesting to see if the triality of the Dynkin diagram $D_4$ would provide insight into the construction of this new modular category from $\mathrm{SO}(8)\times S_3$.


[1] X.-G. Wen, *Quantum Field Theory of Many-body Systems: From the Origin of Sound to an Origin of Light and Electrons*, Oxford Graduate Texts (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004).
[2] C. Nayak, S. H. Simon, A. Stern, M. Freedman, and S. D. Sarma, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 1083 (2008), arXiv:0707.1889.
[3] S. B. Bravyi and A. Kitaev, quant-ph/9811052.
[4] H. Bombin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 030403 (2010), arXiv:1004.1838.
[5] A. Kitaev and L. Kong, Comm. Math. Phys. **313**, 351 (2012).
[6] M. Barkeshli and X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. X **2**, 031013 (2012), arXiv:1112.3311.
[7] Y.-Z. You and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 161107 (2012), arXiv:1204.0113.
[8] Y.-Z. You, C.-M. Jian, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 045106 (2013), arXiv:1208.4109.
[9] N. H. Lindner, E. Berg, G. Refael, and A. Stern, Phys. Rev. X **2**, 041002 (2012), arXiv:1204.5733.
[10] D. J. Clarke, J. Alicea, and K. Shtengel, Nature Comm. **4**, 1348 (2013), arXiv:1204.5479.
[11] M. Cheng, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 195126 (2012), arXiv:1204.6084.
[12] M. Barkeshli, C.-M. Jian, and X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 045130 (2013), arXiv:1208.4834.
[13] M. Barkeshli, C.-M. Jian, and X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 241103(R) (2013), arXiv:1304.7579.
[14] M. Barkeshli, C.-M. Jian, and X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 235103 (2013), arXiv:1305.7203.
[15] A. Vaezi, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 035132 (2013).
[16] J. C. Teo, A. Roy, and X. Chen, arXiv:1306.1538.
[17] J. C. Y. Teo, A. Roy, and X. Chen, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 155111 (2014), arXiv:1308.5984.
[18] B. J. Brown, S. D. Bartlett, A. C. Doherty, and S. D. Barrett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 220402 (2013).
[19] O. Petrova, P. Mellado, and O. Tchernyshyov, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 140405 (2013).
[20] A. Kapustin, arXiv:1306.4254.
[21] M. N. Khan, J. C. Y. Teo, and T. L. Hughes, arXiv:1403.6478.
[22] A. Y. Kitaev, Annals Phys. **303**, 2 (2003), quant-ph/9707021.
[23] M. H. Freedman, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **95**, 98 (1998).
[24] J. Preskill, in *Introduction to Quantum Computation*, edited by H.-K. Lo, S. Popescu, and T. P. Spiller (World Scientific, 1998), quant-ph/9712048.
[25] M. H. Freedman, M. J. Larsen, and Z. Wang, Commun. Math. Phys. **227**, 605 (2002), quant-ph/0001108.
[26] M. H. Freedman, M. J. Larsen, and Z. Wang, Commun. Math. Phys. **228**, 177 (2002), math/0103200.
[27] M. H. Freedman, A. Kitaev, M. J. Larsen, and Z. Wang, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **40**, 31 (2003), quant-ph/0101025.
[28] F. A. Bais, J. K. Slingerland, and S. M. Haaker, Physical Review Letters **102**, 220403 (2009), arXiv:0812.4596.
[29] S. Beigi, P. W. Shor, and D. Whalen, Comm. Math. Phys. **306**, 663 (2011).
[30] J. Wang and X.-G. Wen, arXiv:1212.4863.
[31] M. Levin, Phys. Rev. X **3**, 021009 (2013).
[32] T. Lan, J. Wang, and X.-G. Wen, arXiv:1408.6514.
[33] L.-Y. Hung and Y. Wan, arXiv:1408.0014.
[34] M. Barkeshli and X.-L. Qi, arXiv:1302.2673.
[35] M. Barkeshli, E. Berg, and S. Kivelson, Science **346**, 722 (2014), arXiv:1402.6321.
[36] M. Barkeshli, Y. Oreg, and X.-L. Qi, arXiv:1401.3750.
[37] T. Iadecola, T. Neupert, C. Chamon, and C. Mudry, arXiv:1407.4129.

[38] X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 165113 (2002).
[39] A. P. Schnyder, S. Ryu, A. Furusaki, and A. W. W. Ludwig, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 195125 (2008).
[40] A. Kitaev, AIP Conf. Proc. **1134**, 22 (2009).
[41] M. Z. Hasan and C. L. Kane, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 3045 (2010).
[42] X.-L. Qi and S.-C. Zhang, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 1057 (2011).
[43] L. Fidkowski and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 134509 (2010).
[44] A. M. Turner, F. Pollmann, and E. Berg, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 075102 (2011).
[45] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 035107 (2011).
[46] L. Fidkowski and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 075103 (2011).
[47] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 155114 (2013), arXiv:1106.4772.
[48] Y.-M. Lu and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 125119 (2012).
[49] M. Levin and A. Stern, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 115131 (2012), arXiv:1205.1244.
[50] D. Freed and G. Moore, Annales Henri Poincaré **14**, 1927 (2013).
[51] A. M. Essin and M. Hermele, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 104406 (2013).
[52] Y.-M. Lu and A. Vishwanath, arXiv:1302.2634.
[53] A. Mesaros and Y. Ran, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 155115 (2013).
[54] Z. Bi, A. Rasmussen, and C. Xu, arXiv:1309.0515.
[55] A. Kapustin, arXiv:1403.1467.
[56] C. Wang, A. C. Potter, and T. Senthil, Science **343**, 629 (2014).
[57] T. Neupert, C. Chamon, C. Mudry, and R. Thomale (2014), arXiv:1403.0953.
[58] M. A. Metlitski, L. Fidkowski, X. Chen, and A. Vishwanath, arXiv:1406.3032.
[59] D. S. Freed, arXiv:1406.7278.
[60] D. V. Else and C. Nayak, arXiv:1409.5436.
[61] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Lett. A **93**, 464 (1983).
[62] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1153 (1983).
[63] C. L. Kane and E. J. Mele, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 146802 (2005).
[64] C. L. Kane and E. J. Mele, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 226801 (2005).
[65] B. A. Bernevig, T. Hughes, and S. Zhang, Science **314**, 1757 (2006).
[66] L. Fu, C. L. Kane, and E. J. Mele, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 106803 (2007).
[67] J. E. Moore and L. Balents, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 121306 (2007).
[68] R. Roy, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 195322 (2009).
[69] R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1395 (1983).
[70] L. Balents, Nature **464**, 199 (2010).
[71] M. Levin and Z.-C. Gu, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 115109 (2012).
[72] L.-Y. Hung and X.-G. Wen, arXiv:1211.2767.
[73] B. Swingle, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 035451 (2014).
[74] M. Cheng and Z.-C. Gu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 141602 (2014).
[75] F. A. Bais and J. K. Slingerland, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 045316 (2009), arXiv:0808.0627.
[76] M. Barkeshli and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 216804 (2010), arXiv:1007.2030.
[77] M. Barkeshli and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 115121 (2011).
[78] F. J. Burnell, S. H. Simon, and J. K. Slingerland, New J. Phys. **14**, 015004 (2012).
[79] V. Turaev, math/0005291.
[80] A. J. Kirillov, math/0401119.
[81] P. Etingof, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik, Quantum Topology **1**, 209 (2010), arXiv:0909.3140.
[82] V. Turaev, *Homotopy Quantum Field Theory* (European Mathematical Society, 2010).
[83] S. Burciu and S. Natale, J. Math. Phys. **54**, 013511 (2013).
[84] K. Walker and Z. Wang, Frontiers of Physics **7**, 150 (2012), arXiv:1104.2632.
[85] C. W. von Keyserlingk, F. J. Burnell, and S. H. Simon, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 045107 (2013), arXiv:1208.5128.
[86] A. Vishwanath and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. X **3**, 011016 (2013), arXiv:1209.3058.
[87] C. Wang and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 235122 (2013), arXiv:1302.6234.
[88] C. Wang, A. C. Potter, and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 115137 (2013), arXiv:1306.3223.
[89] P. Bonderson, C. Nayak, and X.-L. Qi, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **9**, 09016 (2013), arXiv:1306.3230.
[90] X. Chen, L. Fidkowski, and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 165132 (2014), arXiv:1306.3250.
[91] M. A. Metlitski, C. L. Kane, and M. P. A. Fisher, arXiv:1306.3286.
[92] X. Chen, F. J. Burnell, A. Vishwanath, and L. Fidkowski, arXiv:1403.6491.
[93] G. Y. Cho, J. C. Y. Teo, and S. Ryu, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 235103 (2014).
[94] A. Kapustin and R. Thorngren, arXiv:1404.3230.
[95] A. Kitaev, Annals Phys. **321**, 2 (2006), cond-mat/0506438.
[96] J. Fröhlich, J. Fuchs, I. Runkel, and C. Schweigert, Nucl. Phys. B **763**, 354 (2007).
[97] A. Kapustin, arXiv:1004.2307.
[98] J. Fuchs, C. Schweigert, and A. Valentino, Commun. Math. Phys. **321**, 543 (2013), arXiv:1203.4568.
[99] P. D. Francesco, P. Mathieu, and D. Senechal, *Conformal Field Theory* (Springer, 1997).
[100] R. Dijkgraaf, C. Vafa, E. Verlinde, and H. Verlinde, Comm. Math. Phys. **123**, 485 (1989).
[101] M. Müger, Journal of Algebra **277**, 256 (2004).
[102] M. Barkeshli and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 045323 (2010), arXiv:0909.4882.
[103] M. Barkeshli and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 085114 (2012), arXiv:1012.2417.
[104] A. Bruguières, Math. Ann **316**, 215 (2000).
[105] M. Müger, Advances in Mathematics **150**, 151 (2000).
[106] L. Kong, Nucl. Phys. B **886**, 436 (2014), arXiv:1307.8244.
[107] I. Eliens, J. Romers, and F. Bais, arxiv:1310.6001.
[108] V. G. Turaev, *Quantum Invariants of Knots and 3-Manifolds* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1994).
[109] B. Bakalov and A. Kirillov, *Lectures on Tensor Categories and Modular Functors*, vol. 21 of *University Lecture Series* (American Mathematical Society, 2001).
[110] J. Preskill (2004), lecture notes, URL `http://www.theory.caltech.edu/~preskill/ph219/topological.ps`.
[111] P. H. Bonderson, Ph.D. thesis, California Institute of Technology (2007).
[112] P. Bonderson, K. Shtengel, and J. K. Slingerland, Annals of Physics **323**, 2709 (2008), arXiv:0707.4206.
[113] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998), 2nd ed.
[114] C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. B **206**, 421 (1988).
[115] P. Bonderson, K. Shtengel, and J. K. Slingerland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 016401 (2006), cond-mat/0601242.
[116] P. Bonderson, K. Shtengel, and J. K. Slingerland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 070401 (2007), quant-ph/0608119.
[117] E. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. B **300**, 360 (1988).
[118] L. Fidkowski, X. Chen, and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. X **3**, 041016 (2013), arXiv:1305.5851.
[119] M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1535 (2000).
[120] A. Paramekanti and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 245118 (2004).

[121] M. B. Hastings, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 104431 (2004).
[122] M. B. Hastings, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **70**, 824 (2005).
[123] M. P. Zaletel and A. Vishwanath, arXiv:1410.2894.
[124] A. Y. Kitaev, Physics-Uspekhi **44**, 131 (2001), cond-mat/0010440.
[125] R. M. Lutchyn, J. D. Sau, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 077001 (2010), arXiv:1002.4033.
[126] Y. Oreg, G. Refael, and F. von Oppen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 177002 (2010), arXiv:1003.1145.
[127] P. Fendley, J. Stat. Mech. p. P11020 (2012), arXiv:1209.0472.
[128] P. Bonderson, M. Freedman, and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 010501 (2008), arXiv:0802.0279.
[129] P. Bonderson, M. Freedman, and C. Nayak, Annals Phys. **324**, 787 (2009), arXiv:0808.1933.
[130] P. Bonderson, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 035113 (2013), arXiv:1210.7929.
[131] M. Zaletel, arXiv:1309.7387.
[132] L.-Y. Hung and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 075121 (2014), arXiv:1311.5539.
[133] P. Etingof, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik, Ann. Math. **162**, 581 (2005).
[134] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110404 (2006), hep-th/0510092.
[135] M. Levin and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110405 (pages 4) (2006), cond-mat/0510613.
[136] E. Fradkin and S. H. Shenker, Phys. Rev. D **19**, 3682 (1979).
[137] P. Deligne, Moscow Math. Journal **2**, 227 (2002).
[138] P. Etingof and S. Gelaki, arXiv:math/0007196.
[139] V. Drinfeld, S. Gelaki, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik, Selecta Mathematica **16**, 1 (2010).
[140] M. Metlitski, unpublished.
[141] K. S. Brown, *Cohomology of Groups* (Springer-Verlag, 1982).
[142] G. Moore and N. Seiberg, Physics Letters B **220**, 422 (1989), ISSN 0370-2693.
[143] R. Dijkgraaf and E. Witten, Commun. Math. Phys. **129**, 393 (1990).
[144] M. de Wild Propitius, Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam (1995).
[145] R. Dijkgraaf, V. Pasquier, and P. Roche, Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Modern Quantum Field Theory (1991).
[146] Y. Hu, Y. Wan, and Y.-S. Wu, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 125114 (2013), arXiv:1211.3695.
[147] C.-H. Lin and M. Levin, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 195130 (2014), arXiv:1402.4081.
[148] Z.-C. Gu and M. Levin, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 201113 (2014).
[149] X.-L. Qi, New J. Phys. **15**, 065002 (2013).
[150] S. Ryu and S.-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 245132 (2012).
[151] H. Yao and S. Ryu, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 064507 (2013).
[152] Z. Bi, M. Cheng, and Z.-C. Gu, unpublished.
[153] Z. Bi, A. Rasmussen, Y.-Z. You, M. Cheng, and C. Xu, arXiv:1404.6256.
[154] V. Kalmeyer and R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2095 (1987).
[155] Y.-M. Lu and L. Fidkowski, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 115321 (2014).
[156] D. Tambara and S. Yamagami, Journal of Algebra **209**, 692 (1998).
[157] D. Clarke, private communication.
[158] M. Titsworth, private communications.
[159] A. Y. Kitaev, Annals Phys. **303**, 2 (2003), quant-ph/9707021.
[160] X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 016803 (2003), quant-ph/0205004.
[161] M. Cheng, unpublished.
[162] S. X. Cui, S.-M. Hong, and Z. Wang, arXiv:1401.7096.
[163] F. J. Burnell, X. Chen, L. Fidkowski, and A. Vishwanath, arXiv:1302.7072.
[164] M. Hartl and S. Leroy, arXiv:0707.0291.
[165] S. X. Cui, C. Galindo, J. Plavnik, and Z. Wang, unpublished.
[166] A. M. Cegarra, A. R. Garón, and J. A. Ortega, Journal of Algebra **241**, 620 (2001).
[167] M. Müger, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **87**, 291 (2003), arXiv:math/0201017.
[168] L. Fidkowski, N. Lindner, and A. Kitaev, unpublished.
[169] J. Teo, T. Hughes, and E. Fradkin, unpublished.
[170] G. Karpilovsky, *Projective Representation of Finite Groups*, vol. 94 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics* (Marcel Dekker, New York/Basel, 1985).
[171] J. C. Baez and A. D. Lauda, Theory and Applications of Categories **12**, 423 (2004), arXiv:math/0307200.
[172] It is often assumed that the set of topological charges $\mathcal{C}$ is finite, but we may allow it to be infinite in the definition of a fusion tensor category or a braided tensor category, as long as fusion is finite. However, for a modular tensor category, we will require $\mathcal{C}$ to be a finite set.
[173] In fact, we believe that all gauge transformations of a BTC that leave the basic data unchanged must take this form and thus they are actually natural isomorphisms, so that the two concepts are synonymous for BTCs.
[174] In mathematical parlance, the braided auto-equivalence maps $\varphi$ are 1-automorphism functors, the natural isomorphisms $\Upsilon$ are 2-isomorphisms between the auto-equivalence functor, and the decomposition freedom of natural isomorphisms (given by the phase factors $\zeta_a$) are the automorphisms of the identity functor.
[175] Given a group $G$, a $G$ torsor is a non-empty set $X$ upon which $G$ acts freely and transitively. In other words, it is what you get if the group $G$ had lost its identity. In the context of classification, this means that distinct symmetry fractionalization classes are related to each other by the action of distinct elements of $H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A})$.
[176] We note that, given $H^{\alpha}_{a,\bar{a};0}$ and its ground state $|\Psi^{\alpha}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle$, it is always possible to construct a Hamiltonian for which another state $|\Psi^{\beta}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rangle$ in this universality class is the ground state. In particular, one can use $h^{(j)}_{a;\beta} = V^{(j)}\left[h^{(j)}_{a;\alpha} + H^{(j)}_0\right]V^{(j)-1} - H^{(j)}_0$, where $H^{(j)}_0$ is the sum of the terms in $H_0$ that act nontrivially in $\mathcal{R}_j$.
[177] From this, we can see that $|\Psi^{\alpha}_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a),\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(\bar{a});0}\rangle$ is the ground state of the Hamiltonian $H^{\alpha}_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a),\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(\bar{a});0} = \rho_{\mathbf{g}} H^{\alpha}_{a,\bar{a};0}\rho^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}}$, for which the corresponding $h^{(j)}_{\rho_{\mathbf{g}}(a);\alpha} = \rho_{\mathbf{g}}\left[h^{(j)}_{a;\alpha} + H^{(j)}_0\right]\rho^{-1}_{\mathbf{g}} - H^{(j)}_0$ is again localized within $\mathcal{R}_j$, where $H^{(j)}_0$ is the sum of the terms in $H_0$ that act nontrivially in $\mathcal{R}_j$.
[178] Such an operator localized in $\mathcal{R}_j$ can be defined, for example, by taking $B^{(j)}_{\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}} = \sum_{a,b}\beta_a(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h})S_{0a}S_{ab}W_b(\partial\mathcal{R}_j)$, where $W_b(\partial\mathcal{R}_j)$ is a Wilson loop of topological charge $b$ whose path follows the loop delineated by the boundary $\partial\mathcal{R}_j$ (or just inside the boundary) of the region in a counterclockwise fashion.
[179] We could modify this definition slightly to include also the plaquettes that contain the end-points of the line $C$. Such a modification corresponds to a local change in the Hamiltonian and would also describe a $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{g}^{-1}$ pair of defects.
[180] This requires a detailed understanding of gapped line defects; see, e.g., Refs. [5, 14].
[181] After introducing $G$-crossed braiding in the next section, we will see that the same charge $b_{\mathbf{0}}$ can always be used for either left or right fusion with $a_{\mathbf{g}}$ to obtain $c_{\mathbf{g}}$, i.e. there exists some

$b_{\mathbf{0}}$ such that $N_{a_{\mathbf{g}}b_{\mathbf{0}}}^{c_{\mathbf{g}}} = N_{\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}c_{\mathbf{g}}}^{b_{\mathbf{0}}} = N_{c_{\mathbf{g}}\overline{a_{\mathbf{g}}}}^{b_{\mathbf{0}}} = N_{b_{\mathbf{0}}a_{\mathbf{g}}}^{c_{\mathbf{g}}} \neq 0$.

[182] Had we allowed the $G$-crossed braiding action to depend on the topological charge value, rather than only depending on the corresponding group element, i.e. if we replaced $\rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ with a more general map $\rho_{a_{\mathbf{g}}}$, compatibility with fusion would require that $\rho_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} \circ \rho_{b_{\mathbf{h}}} = \rho_{c_{\mathbf{gh}}}$ whenever $N_{ab}^{c} \neq 0$. Combining this this an axiom that $\rho_{b_{\mathbf{0}}}$ act trivially on all topological charges for all $b_{\mathbf{0}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$, i.e. $\rho_{b_{\mathbf{0}}}(e) = e$ for any $e \in \mathcal{C}_G^{\times}$, would lead back to $\rho_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} = \rho_{\mathbf{g}}$ being independent of the particular topological charge $a$ within $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$. In particular, for any two distinct charges $a_{\mathbf{g}} \neq c_{\mathbf{g}}$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}}$ , there is always some $b_{\mathbf{0}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ with $N_{ab}^{c} \neq 0$, and hence $\rho_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} = \rho_{a_{\mathbf{g}}} \circ \rho_{b_{\mathbf{0}}} = \rho_{c_{\mathbf{g}}}$. This axiom is physically natural, because the topological charges in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$ correspond to quasiparticles, which are truly point-like localized (they do not have defect branch cut lines) and hence should be unable to alter operators or topological charges localized in a distant region, unless it enters that region.

[183] We note that while critical exponents for local correlation functions can be captured in this way, non-local correlations and the topological structure of the critical points may have subtle differences depending on the rest of the structure of the topological phases in question.

[184] There can also be an obstruction to the group extension, which is classified by $H_{\tilde{\rho}}^{3}(G, \mathrm{Z}(H))$.

[185] In fact, one can show that every element of $\mathrm{Z}(H)$ corresponds to an Abelian anyon in the quantum double $\mathrm{D}(H)$. To see this, recall that elements of $\mathrm{D}(H)$ are labelled by $([\mathbf{h}], \pi(C_{\mathbf{h}}))$, where $\mathbf{h}$ labels a conjugacy class and $\pi(C_{\mathbf{h}})$ is an irreducible representation of the centralizer of $\mathbf{h}$. Every element in $\mathrm{Z}(H)$ corresponds to a distinct conjugacy class in $H$ with $C_{\mathbf{h}} \simeq H$. The Abelian anyons in this conjugacy class are in one-to-one correspondence with group homomorphisms of $H$ to $\mathrm{U}(1)$. In particular, there is a trivial homomorphism $\mathbb{1}$ where each group element is mapped to 1, corresponding to an Abelian anyon $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbb{1})$. This shows that $\mathrm{Z}(H)$ is a true subgroup of the Abelian anyons in $\mathrm{D}(H)$ as long as $H^1(H, \mathrm{U}(1))$ is not empty. This statement does not hold in general for twisted quantum doubles, where the $\pi(C_{\mathbf{h}})$ may be a projective irreducible representation, which, in general, may not be one-dimensional, and therefore $(\mathbf{h}, \pi(C_{\mathbf{h}}))$ may not be Abelian for any $\pi(C_{\mathbf{h}})$.